

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

JUL 20 1951

AP

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

The
London Quarterly
Review

WITH WHICH IS INCORPORATED THE HOLBORN REVIEW
LITERATURE · HISTORY · SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION · THEOLOGY · PHILOSOPHY
EDITOR · LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

Contributors Include

JOHN C. BOWMER, M.A., B.D.
G. THACKRAY EDDY, M.A., B.D.
MALDWYN L. EDWARDS, M.A., Ph.D.
G. H. FINDLAY, M.A.
REGINALD GLANVILLE
T. DRIFFIELD HAWKIN
G. A. LARDI, B.A.
KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE, M.A., D.D.
ATKINSON LEE, M.A.
SYDNEY H. MOORE, M.A.
E. GORDON RUPP, M.A., B.D.
C. RYDER SMITH, B.A., D.D.
C. KENT WRIGHT, B.A.

London

THE EPWORTH PRESS
(FRANK H. CUMBERS)

JULY 1951

PRICE FOUR SHILLINGS NET

The London Quarterly Review

LITERATURE HISTORY SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION THEOLOGY PHILOSOPHY

Editor: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW is published on the 25th of March, June, September, and December by the Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1. It may be obtained from the publishers or any bookseller at 4s. a copy (postage 3d.) or 15s. per annum, post free.

All contributions (typewritten, if possible), should be addressed to The Editor, 'THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW', 25-35 City Road, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Britain's first care —the Children !

Among the many questions engaging the attention of political, religious and social workers, none is more important than the cause of the child. The question is important even when children are born and reared in good homes, but it becomes urgent when it concerns those who start life handicapped by orphanhood or neglect

For eighty-two years the National Children's Home has been helping these little people, during which period over 35,000 boys and girls have been given the chance which misfortune has denied. The Home still depends on voluntary contributions and an earnest appeal is made for continued and even increased support to meet the rising cost of maintaining this work.

— Covenanted gifts and legacies are specially solicited. —

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

Chief Offices: Highbury Park, London, N.5

Editorial Comments

A LETTER FROM JOHN WESLEY

THE DISCOVERY of an unpublished letter written by John Wesley is always an event. The following is the text of one recently acquired by the Methodist Publishing House:

Near London
April 25th 1777

DEAR SIR,

We old men need not use ceremony toward each other: We have seen more of it in the world than we like. We may speak plain: What should hinder? We have no ill designs upon each other. My design ever since I saw you first at Dorking was to do you all the good I could. It is true this is not a very easy matter: for you are not too easy to be advised. Men of Seventy seldom are; for age is apt to stiffen our minds as well as our bodies. And perhaps you are a little too apt to lean to your own understanding: This I have frequently observed with concern. Do you not likewise halt on the same foot with me? Are you not warm enough? My anger would be as a whirlwind, if I did not watch continually. Does yours never break loose? Yet, I can say I never saw you in a passion. But does not God see? And is it not high time now you are on the verge of Eternity, to cast off every weight? To throw aside the sin that so easily besets you, and so prepare to meet your God?

But perhaps you expect I should say something on another head. Then I will and with all plainness. You say: 'Nay speak not of it: I tell you I will give nothing: not a shilling not a farthing.' Pray do not say so before you are asked. This is neither sense nor manners. 'But there was no necessity for building.' There was an absolute necessity. For as soon as the lunatics are removed from St Luke's the Foundry will be pulled down. And we have multitudes of old and decrepit people, who can never get to Spitalfields or West Street. Yet I allow there is no necessity for your giving anything, unless you love me, unless you love the Work of God, unless you desire to lay up treasure in heaven; unless you desire the blessing of God to come now upon your Soul and Body and all that you have! If so you may send five, fifty, five hundred pounds to Dear Sir,

Your affectionate Servant,
JOHN WESLEY.

There is no direct indication as to whom this letter was sent, though one is tempted to hazard a guess. The circumstances in which it was written are clear. On 18th October 1776 a circular had been sent out by John Wesley, asking for subscriptions toward the building of a new chapel in City Road to take the place of the old Foundry which was to be pulled down. The need was urgent, and Wesley felt it only fair that the 'parent society' which had generously helped others 'all over England' for more than thirty years, should now receive their support.

The district of Finsbury and Moorfields was being re-planned. Some buildings were to be demolished and new houses erected. The City had granted the Methodists a site on certain conditions, which were later modified. The first appeal realized about £1000 toward the original estimate of £6000, and Wesley

continued to make personal approaches to private individuals and to take special collections at some of the places where he preached. On Monday, 21st April 1777 he laid the foundation stone of what is now universally known as Wesley's Chapel, City Road. On the following Friday he wrote the letter under consideration. The recipient had either resented the appeals made at the ceremony on Monday or had definitely refused some personal request. The latter alternative seems to be ruled out by the phrase: 'Pray do not so say before you are asked'. It is evident that Wesley, who was seventy-four years of age, felt the criticism keenly. Perhaps the writing of the letter restored him! The entry in his Journal for Sunday 27th April 1777 reads: 'The sun breaking out, I snatched the opportunity of preaching to many thousands in Moorfields. All were still as night while I showed how "the Son of God was manifested to destroy the works of the devil".' Next day he was off by coach to the North, and was preaching in Newcastle-on-Tyne on Wednesday.

Building went on, during the next few months, in Finsbury and in Moorfields, where Wesley preached again on 17th August—probably for the last time on that site. In spite of the changes and the opposition, the new chapel was opened on 1st November 1778. The crowd which gathered for the ceremony was so great that many feared a disturbance, but 'all was quietness, decency, and order'. The Methodist 'cathedral' was no longer a dream. It had become reality.

THE EIGHTH ECUMENICAL METHODIST CONFERENCE

THE delegates meeting in the eighth Ecumenical Methodist Conference to be held in Oxford (28th August to 7th September 1951) will represent nearly forty million Methodists, including thirteen million who are in full membership as communicants. These figures are impressive when one remembers they are the result of steady growth in the relatively short period of two centuries. There is something Pentecostal about the beginnings of the Methodist Church with its little 'Societies' sharing a living experience in a hostile world. The history of its subsequent development is not so much a record of emotional outbursts and mass movements as an account of the divinely-guided expansion of a living organism. Numerical returns make this Conference significant but the present world situation makes it vitally important.

It meets at a time when intelligent and intimate co-operation between the peoples of the British Commonwealth and the United States of America is imperative if the world is to be saved from disaster. At a peak moment in civilization the rapid secularization of society is threatening its foundations. New scientific discoveries may pave the way to hell or heaven. The crisis is not 'on the lap of the gods'; it is in the hands of free men, whose freedom and new knowledge may become a curse or a blessing. The breakdown of society is imminent unless spiritual values are restored and man realizes his direct relationship to his Creator.

In such an hour each separate Christian communion—and not least 'the people called Methodists'—has a specific contribution to make. Part of the task of the Ecumenical Conference at Oxford will be to reassess the Methodist

tradition in terms which will show its relevance to modern social problems, to present tendencies in thought, and to the immediate international situation. The meaning of the Methodist emphasis on evangelism must be interpreted, so that it becomes operative in the present crisis.

Closely related to this is the urgent need of furthering the Reunion of Christendom—no longer an academic question but a living issue. In spite of disappointing actions and attitudes by minorities of extremists, there is a real hope of the Christian Church rising to the challenge and ceasing to be its own worst enemy, in this hour when through it can come the salvation of the world. There are at least forty self-governing Methodist Conferences and the gathering at Oxford may do something to make plain the value of the Methodist emphasis in a re-united Church.

CAPTAIN THOMAS WEBB

Envoy Extraordinary to the Anglo-American Peoples

THE FIRST expansion of Methodism in America was due largely to a few colonists, chiefly German-Irish Protestants like Philip Embury and Barbara Heck, and to a British officer, 'Captain' Thomas Webb, lieutenant in the 42nd and 48th Regiment of Foot. His work has been under-estimated, though it was in some ways prophetic of Methodism's astonishing future. His journeyings between England and America made him almost an Anglo-American, and his evangelistic efforts were an early factor in the creation of what is now called World Methodism. With the directness of the soldier he seized opportunities which were not apparent to other people. If Wesley said the world was his parish, Webb preached as though he took it for granted.

In a letter from New York, dated 11th April 1768, the writer told John Wesley of his experiences in America in October 1767. Asking his host in New York if there were any Methodists in the town he learnt that there was 'one Captain Webb, a strange sort of man, who lived on Long Island, and who sometimes preached at one Embury's, at the rigging-house'.

'Strange' he certainly appeared—with a green patch over an empty eye-socket, his scarlet tunic with the badges of the 48th Regiment of Foot proclaiming that he held the King's Commission, and his sword laid carefully across the open Bible as he preached.

Men knew him for a real soldier. He had fought at the siege of Louisburg and been almost mortally wounded. A bullet striking his right temple had destroyed his eye, passed into his mouth—and he swallowed it. He was carried to the rear, and rowed through the angry surf to the British camp. 'He needs no help. He's dead enough,' said a soldier as he lifted him out of the boat. A faint whisper came from his twisted lips. 'I'm not dead,' said Webb, and lived another forty years to prove it. 'God in His mercy spared me,' he used to say, 'I was not then fit to die. And now I sorrow not at the loss of bodily sight, since he has opened my eyes to see wondrous things out of his law.'

But the spiritual transformation was not immediate. On the grim night of 12th September 1759 he was with the little column which stormed the Heights of Abraham and next morning he saw General Wolfe die at the moment of

final victory. In the next ten years he served in Bristol, was converted, became a preacher of the Gospel, returned on duty to America with his regiment, and busied himself with buying a site for a Methodist chapel in New York. To that shrewd New Yorker he seemed in 1767 'a strange sort of man' but the unfolding years revealed him as an 'envoy extraordinary' and a soldier of Christ, who had consecrated his courage and his initiative to the service of the Kingdom of God.

His conversion, which has been mistakenly described as occurring whilst he listened to John Wesley, seems to have been the result of a personal experience in 1764. Depressed by a deep sense of sin, he prayed for guidance and found it, somewhat strangely, in Isaiah 547-9: 'For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee . . . so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee.' He accepted these words as a direct promise from God. Through the preaching of Mr Cary, a Moravian minister, he found the peace he had been seeking so long—probably since the day his battered body was rescued from the surf at Louisburg.

His introduction to the Methodists came through his association with the Rev. James Roquet, son of a French Protestant refugee, once master at Kingswood School and later curate of St Werburgh's, Bristol. In the Society at Bristol he met John Wesley, and was at once deeply impressed. It was not long before he saw an opportunity of making his public confession of faith. At Bath, a preacher failed to fulfil his appointment and Captain Webb, who was in the congregation, stood up boldly to give his testimony. Already he was caught into the pattern of the World Church. His adventurous soul had been influenced by a Moravian, a French refugee become Anglican, and John Wesley the Methodist. He was just over forty years of age, had lived a full life but felt, now, that he stood on the threshold of a new and more important adventure.

He embarked for America with his regiment and on his arrival was appointed Barrack Master at Albany. Soon afterwards he sought out a little band of Methodists meeting in New York. His coming filled them with fear. Scarlet tunic, military sash, golden epaulettes—here was Authority come surely to 'spy out their liberties', and forbid their services. To their astonishment he knelt with them in prayer and soon convinced them of his spiritual experience. He spoke with conviction, the people crowded to hear him. The room was too small, the street was notorious but there were souls eager to hear the message.

An old loft, sixty feet by eighteen, was available in William Street. It had been used for storing sails and spars; its very walls reeked of tar. But there was no time to build a cathedral! An old ship's figurehead lay forgotten in a corner. It made an admirable reading-desk and pulpit. The 'gypsy king' with gilded crown—one of the Magi, crudely carved, its wood soaked with the salt of the seven seas—was not out of harmony with the battered warrior who preached from it. The 'rigging-loft' became to many the gate of heaven. In it, men homesick and uncertain of themselves and one another, found a true perspective. They realized they were shaping a New World and they pledged themselves, by the grace of God, to make it part of His Kingdom.

More people came. They crowded the street that they might listen. The little Society was perplexed. They must build a church—but where and how? Philip Embury thought they might rent a plot of ground and put up a wooden

Tabernacle. The lease would only run for twenty-one years, and they were looking to a more distant future. Before they clinched the matter they spent two days in prayer and fasting, and suddenly the way was made plain. A young man offered ten pounds toward buying a site, and they found two plots for sale for six hundred pounds! It seemed an impossible proposition, but one of the members, in a letter to John Wesley, wrote: 'We called once more on God for His direction and resolved to purchase the whole.' It was a great responsibility for eight men, but Captain Webb and his friend Mr Lupton were two of the number. They gave handsomely and guaranteed or lent a further two hundred pounds. Still, some money must be borrowed at seven per cent, and local opposition was strong. 'Before we began to talk of building, the devil and his children were very peaceable; but since this affair took place many ministers have cursed us in the name of the Lord, and laboured with all their might to stop their congregations from assisting us. But He that sitteth in the highest laughed them to scorn! Many have broken through and given their friendly assistance. . . .' Some of the members said they should appeal to Mr Wesley for a collection in England. Others, with memories of the struggling Societies from which they had so recently come, hated the idea of adding to their burdens. Perhaps Mr Wesley could appeal to certain individuals. After all it was 'the first preaching-house on the original Methodist plan in all America—excepting Mr. Whitefield's orphan-house in Georgia. . . .'

The ground would never have been bought without the help of Captain Webb, and money was still needed, but much more urgent was the need of an officially-appointed preacher. 'If possible we must have a man of wisdom, of sound faith, and a good disciplinarian: one whose heart and soul are in the work; and I doubt not but by the goodness of God such a flame will soon be kindled as would never stop until it reached the great South Sea. We may make many shifts to evade temperal inconveniences; but we cannot purchase such a preacher. . . .' Such was the appeal which went by letter to John Wesley on 11th April 1768. The writer, expressing the wishes of the whole Society, naïvely suggested the route the preacher should take from Bristol, Liverpool, or Dublin, in July or August! 'With respect to money for the payment of the preachers' passage over, if they could not procure it, we would sell our coats and shirts to procure it for them.' The letter began by asking for a preacher, but the enthusiasm of its writer increased and the request passed easily from the singular to the plural. They needed many preachers!

It was not unsuccessful. From the Conference in Leeds, in August 1769, Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor volunteered for service in America and landed at Gloucester Point, six miles from Philadelphia, on 24th October 1769. Seven days later Pilmoor wrote to John Wesley, describing the situation there: 'We were not a little surprised to find Captain Webb in town, and a society of about one hundred members, who desire to be in close connexion with you.' From the day he came to Albany the Captain had preached wherever he saw an opportunity. On Long Island, where his wife's people lived, he had formed a Society, and he made Philadelphia his peculiar care. He had prepared the ground for Pilmoor, who preached the first Sunday after his arrival, on the common where he used 'the stage appointed for the horse race' for his pulpit. Between four and five thousand people heard him 'with attention

still as night'. It was obvious that Webb's preaching had not been in vain.

Apparently he had retired from the Army in 1767 since his name disappeared from the Army List that year. Dependent on his pension he, nevertheless, decided to devote his time to the work of a Methodist preacher, though he remained an independent layman.

In 1772 he returned to England and attended the Leeds Conference to appeal for help for the Methodist Societies in America. He was particularly anxious to persuade Joseph Benson to go back with him, and Benson seriously considered the request. He received a letter from John Wesley on 2nd March 1773, which, whilst non-committal, was discouraging. Benson must obey his conscience and not be over-persuaded. Five days later, Charles Wesley wrote him in much stronger terms, passing an unjustified opinion on Webb: 'I have barely time to say your own reasons for not yet going to America, and Christopher Hopper's are unanswerable. Mr Fletcher is only the Captain's echo. The Captain's impressions are no more (or very little more) to be depended on than George Bell's. He is an inexperienced, honest, zealous, loving enthusiast.' It is a strange letter. In the first place it suggests that a man to whom Fletcher of Madeley would react as 'an echo' was at least a personality. In the second place it compares him to George Bell who was unstable and fanatical. The comparison is watered down, and then completely neutralized by the concluding sentence. It was evident that the impulsive and independent action of Captain Webb had displeased the Wesleys. It was some years before they realized the true value of the man. Meanwhile, John Fletcher had come to know him more intimately, and supported him in his appeal to Joseph Benson, which was, nevertheless, unsuccessful. On 12th February 1773 the Captain, who was then a widower, was married, by the Vicar of Madeley to Grace Gilbert, at Whitchurch, Shropshire. On Good Friday, 9th April 1773, the two set sail for America. Two Methodist preachers went with them—Thomas Rankin and George Shadford—but not Joseph Benson.

The first Methodist Conference in America met on 14th July 1773 and Thomas Webb was one of the ten members, but his name does not appear on the 'stations'. Though he seems to have maintained a similar independence to that of Robert Carr Brackenbury in England, he had a very definite sense of vocation, and had become an unofficial liaison officer between English and American Methodism.

When he finally returned to England he settled in Bristol and preached continually, for the most part in the West Country. In his later years he lived at No. 3 Portland Street, close by Portland Chapel, which he helped to build, and where he was buried.

Wherever he went, 'the common people heard him gladly,' though the comments of John Wesley on his preaching appear for some years to have been prejudiced. In his *Journal* he wrote: 'Feb. 2. Tues. 1773: Captain Webb preached at the Foundery. I admire the wisdom of God in still raising up various preachers, according to the various tastes of men. The Captain is all life and fire; therefore, although he is not deep or regular, yet many who would not hear a better preacher flock together to hear him. And many are convinced under his preaching; some justified; a few built up in love.' Is there something a little patronizing in the judgement or is he prejudiced because of

the Captain's persistence in his attempt to take Benson back to America? Seven years later he 'found at Sarum the fruit of Captain Webb's preaching; some were awakened, and one perfected in love'. Even this comment is a little restrained, for he is surprised that some of 'our elder brethren remarked that they had never heard Perfection preached before'. One might justly infer that the doctrine was lacking in Webb's preaching, but this would be completely untrue. In the contemporary correspondence of Mrs E. Bushell there is evidence that he stressed 'Perfection' continually. By 1783 Wesley is, apparently, becoming more convinced of the value of his preaching. There is no longer the critical attitude to the 'popular' preacher! Visiting Devizes he wrote: 'Captain Webb lately kindled a flame here, and it is not yet gone out. Several persons were still rejoicing in God, and the people in general were much quickened.' The next day he commented: 'I found his preaching in the street at Winchester had been blessed greatly. . . . I never saw the preaching-house so crowded before with serious and attentive hearers.' Two years later the verdict is entirely favourable, and one can safely assume that Captain Webb has satisfactorily completed his twenty years probation! This is the entry in Wesley's *Journal* for 12th August 1785: 'I preached at Winchester; and on Saturday went on to Salisbury. As Captain Webb had just been there, I endeavoured to avail myself of the fire which he seldom fails to kindle.'

Sixty years later, the Rev. J. S. Stamp, editing the memoir of Charles Atmore, described Webb as a preacher: 'His addresses were in very plain though heart-searching language and were remarkable for their power.'

Though in his later years the Captain confined his activities to England, his influence could not be limited by geographical boundaries. In the Channel Islands events occurred which showed the reality of the World Church, and gave an early example of World Methodism. At the same time they linked up two men, Squire Brackenbury and Captain Webb, who, though unlike in temperament, yet held irregular, roving commissions amongst the early Methodist preachers. In Jersey, a merchant named Pierre Le Sueur had returned from a business trip to Newfoundland, with a strange sense of the grace of God in his heart. The preaching of Laurence Coughlan, a Methodist ordained by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, had greatly moved him, and when he returned to Jersey he talked continually of his conversion. The Channel Islanders thought him mad—all except John Fentin who supported him, and eventually persuaded a dozen neighbours to form a Society. For four years this small company endured fierce persecution. They were joined by a retired sea-captain but made little progress until some soldiers, converts of Captain Webb, were stationed on the island. They brought some of his fire and vigour with them, and eventually were the means of sending a letter to the Conference assembled at City Road, London, in July 1783. As a result of the appeal for a preacher, Squire Brackenbury answered quietly: 'Here am I. Send me.'

It was a strange but providential sequence of events. The speculative adventuring of a Jersey merchant, the preaching of a Methodist under the auspices of an Anglican Society in Newfoundland, the persistence of a few English soldiers whose whole lives had been changed by Captain Webb, the despatch of a letter written with some trepidation at their request by a travelling

preacher in Hampshire—these were the forces which suddenly focused themselves on a man, frail in body and tormented in mind, sitting in a Conference of which he was not officially a member. As in the case of New York, so indirectly in Jersey, the old officer of the 42nd Regiment, the stalwart soldier of Christ, had done much to shape events.

Geographically his influence had been far-flung and, patriot as he was, he had become a citizen of the world. For him there had never been a colour bar. His first wife's relations had lived at Jamaica, Long Island, and in those earliest days of American Methodism he took a house there. In six months he had gathered twenty-four persons into a Society. They all professed to experience 'justifying grace' and their number included twelve white people and twelve negroes.

As one looks back over the years one seems to see this picturesque figure of a man gathering together the traditions of English and American Methodism in confident anticipation of a World Church to which they will bring their essential contribution.

On the mural tablet which commemorates Captain Webb in Portland Chapel, Bristol, he is described as 'Exemplary for simplicity and godly sincerity'. Of his loyalty, his courage and his deep religious convictions there can be no doubt. Even Charles Wesley described him, when not particularly pleased with him, as honest, zealous, and lovingly enthusiastic.

Of his unselfish and tireless devotion to the work of preaching the Gospel there is ample evidence. In a letter to Thomas Rankin, John Wesley, apparently perplexed by the energy and independence of the Captain, wrote: 'But where is he now, and what is he doing? I fear his wife will have need of patience . . .' And this from John Wesley!

Life did not grow easier for the chivalrous and generous old soldier. Though he made no complaint and gave himself and his goods freely, his income was small. In 1784 John Wesley wrote to William Pitt, First Lord of the Treasury, commending Webb whom he described as his 'old friend'. Lord North had secured him a pension of £100 a year, but this had been reduced and Wesley pointed out that it was hardly 'a maintenance'. He concluded: 'If you could be so good as to remember him in this or any other way I should esteem it a particular favour.'

In his later years Captain Webb was a beloved figure in Bristol Methodism. He urged the building of Portland Chapel, which remains one of the most beautiful of Methodist shrines. On its church roll he appears, toward the end of the eighteenth century, as the leader of the forty-third class. It was to him a distinction more to be prized than even the command of the 42nd or 48th Regiment of Foot.

The day before he died, Charles Atmore visited him and was astonished at his youthful vitality. Describing him as 'that excellent man, truly devoted to God' he adds: 'He has no family, and gives to the cause of God, and to the poor of Christ's flock, the greater part of his income.' Quite suddenly and unexpectedly he died on 21st December 1796 and was buried on Christmas Eve. Most fittingly his body was borne to its last resting place by 'six Local Preachers and the pall-bearers were the Rev. Messrs Bradford, Prichard, Roberts, Davies,

[continued on page 229]

Articles

THE CHURCH AND THE RISE OF SOCIALISM

THE ROMANTIC revival is misnamed. The real significance of that late eighteenth-century movement of thought is not so much that it was in the words of Theodore Watts-Dunton a 'renascence of wonder' but a resurgence of life. Wordsworth could even speak of a fresh dawn. The French Revolution was largely inspired by the intellectual and professional middle classes, but the sound of feet on the Paris streets was that of the people. It was the knitting women who complacently counted the heads that fell into the basket. In England, Godwin and Paine were preaching the rights of men, while Burns was describing a cottar's Saturday night, and protesting in another vein that 'a man's a man for a' that'. George Crabbe with fierce irony, spoke of the 'murmuring poor who will not fast in peace' and William Blake could proceed even farther in his sympathy with the unregarded, and talk of the little Southern Negro child, whose skin was black, but whose soul was white.

The religious counterpart to this discovery of men was in the sermons, hymns and practice of the leaders in the Methodist revival. Next to the incident of wrestling Jacob, it was our Lord's story of the feast deprived of the expected guests but attended by the rabble of highways and hedges, that most excited Charles Wesley's imagination. It was the poor and maimed and halt and blind that were to find in Christ a hearty welcome. The importance of the worthless is unweariedly proclaimed from other stories of Jesus.

Poor debtors, by our Lord's request,
A full requittance we receive,
And criminals, with pardon blest,
We at our Judge's instant, live.

This concern for the vilest was a fitting expression of a theology which set no limits to God's grace but insisted that all may be saved, that all may know they are saved, and that all may pass on to full salvation. Here is the theological setting of the rights of man. In the outworking of Reformation, there has been the fierce independence of the Congregationalists, and later the Quaker insistence on the inner light which is every man's prerogative. It is, however, in the Methodist Revival that individualism comes to its fullest flowering. Here is the full working-out of Luther's insistence on justification by faith. It is no wonder that Methodists set their hands as zealously as the Evangelicals to work of humanitarian reform and to the abolition of slavery.

The many-sided genius of early Methodism is not lightly to be characterized. By tradition and upbringing John and Charles Wesley were High Churchmen of the Laudian School. The high sacramental teaching of their hymns extends not only to the Lord's Supper but to the baptism of infants. The sentiments would offend a modern Anglo-Catholic far less than they would offend a modern Methodist proud of his Free Churchmanship.

Father, if such Thy sovereign Will,
 If Jesus did the rite enjoin,
 Arouse Thy hallowing Spirit's seal,
 And let the grace attend the sign.
 The seed of endless life impart,
 Take for Thine own this infant's heart.

This is but one of the hymns which state a teaching not easy to distinguish from baptismal regeneration. And how infinitely more than a memorial feast is the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Charles Wesley's great Eucharistic hymns.

The brothers knew themselves to be members of the Established Church, and would fain have pledged the Methodist Society to a continuing fidelity.

Part of His Church below,
 We thus our right maintain,
 Our living membership we show
 And in the fold remain,
 The sheep of Israel's fold
 In England's pastures fed,
 And fellowship with all we hold,
 Who hold it with our Head.

It is customary to speak of the Evangelical Revival as the counterpart of Methodism within the Church of England. Doubtless, the streams have the same high mountains as a watershed, and doubtless, they flow down to the same sea, but they follow widely different courses. The Evangelicals were Calvinists in theology and Benthamites in political philosophy. This individualism made them intolerant of any criticism applied to the Bible and indifferent to any criticism applied to the Church. Their emphasis was not on the authority of the Church but the responsibility of the individual. Professor C. G. Cell has shown the striking affinities of Wesley's thoughts with Calvin, but on the essential matter of the decrees Wesley was Arminian, and in his reverence for the Church, its history, traditions and sacraments, Wesley was a High Churchman. In the light of these cleavages of conviction it is understandable that whilst within Evangelicalism there was a strong Whig tradition, Methodism remained actively Tory in its political sympathies.

Those Methodists who are uncompromising Free Churchmen and whose political affiliations have been Liberal, are apt to overlook the collectivism which showed itself from the start in Methodist Churchmanship and political thinking. In like manner those who have remained conservative in ecclesiasticism and in politics and who rejoice to think that John Wesley was a High Churchman and a Tory, are apt to forget the individualism which from the start was inherent in Methodist theology. Wesley, politically speaking, had his blind spots. He had overmuch veneration for the Georges and for the English constitution in the days of an unreformed parliament and the unreformed penal code. He could still say in 1775: 'England from the time of the Conqueror has never enjoyed such liberty, civil or religious, as now. In his *Thoughts on Liberty* he exclaimed: 'What more liberty could men want. We have no chain on us,

even as big as a knitting-needle.' Wesley did not envisage political power for the people. His definition of liberty was that 'each man without restraint could sit under his own vine'. He wanted—and how fair a statement it seems in these Totalitarian days—'an enjoyment of life, fortune, and property, in our own way'. He had no sympathy with democracy in the forms in which he heard it explained. He could not agree with Locke that individuals have certain rights in the state of nature which they carried with them when they made a contract and entered into society. Even as a political fiction it was unacceptable to Wesley because it gave people rights as individuals over against the State. This, in his submission, led to the anarchy of an atomistic democracy. He was equally opposed to Price and Priestley, Goodwin and Paine, because he detected in their championship of the people a plea for freedom without responsibility, for individual rights without social obligations.

The Toryism of Wesley had its limitations but it was not that 'Eldonian' brand castigated by A. V. Dicey. It was neither narrow nor reactionary. It asked that the executive authority of the State should use its power as given by God and should seek by the right ordering of the State the good of the individual. Likewise he wanted the individual to take his proper place and render his proper service within the State. He believed with Edmund Burke that 'kings will be tyrants from policy when subjects are rebel from principle'. He could lay his hand on his heart and say he 'loved a manly, moral, regulated liberty as well as any gentleman'.

After Wesley's death, the strain of the French war, and then industrial and political unrest, led to the unimaginative repressive methods of Sidmouth. Methodism was not unaffected. Indeed, the harsh unbending attitude of Methodist leaders to democratic agitation, persisted long after all danger of revolutionary violence had passed. Yet even this rigid Toryism, far too unmindful of the parts which make the whole, was not without its defence. Methodism in the early years of the nineteenth century needed protection from irresponsible agitators, within and without, if it was to be an independent Church, strong and respected within the life of the nation. Jabez Bunting, who gave the pastoral office its proper authority so that the sheep could be tended, wanted the State likewise to be sufficiently strong to safeguard the wellbeing of its people.

Unhappily, this Toryism, with its Christian inspiration, was not sufficiently sensitive to the needs of the age. Secessions from the parent body culminating in the heart-breaking loss of a hundred thousand members consequent upon the fly-sheet agitation could not be dismissed as 'the noisy clamour of the rabble'. Joseph Rayner Stephens, the highly gifted, eloquent democrat, was an awkward member of any team and his early rabid chartism was highly embarrassing to his Church. Yet his Christian Toryism took account of the people. He declared that 'the altar, the throne, and the cottage, were the true homes of mankind'. It was grievous that his expulsion should have been so quickly enforced, and that others by ejection or resignation should follow. The official policy of Methodism in the last stages of the middle period could not discern with sufficient sympathy and understanding the signs of the times. A policy which had brought the Church safely through the first troubled period needed fresh adaptation for the needs of a fresh age.

The firm hand of Jabez Bunting had rested too long upon Methodism.

Thomas Carlyle was writing his *Latter Day Pamphlets*, Mrs Gaskell was writing her novel, *Mary Barton*, the Chartists were assembling on Kennington Common, but Methodists were otherwise occupied. There was a family quarrel and everybody was taking sides. The people were speaking of rights. Bunting was speaking of duties. No one was there to speak of rights that were also duties. The initiative had passed to the Christian Socialists.

It is well to remember that Charles Kingsley, the fiercest propagandist of them all, was a convinced Tory. F. D. Maurice's *Kingdom of Christ*, the theological text-book of the movement, was an essay in Christian collectivism. John Ludlow had definite connexions with French Socialists, but Tom Hughes was a Tory philanthropist, described by D. C. Somervell as a 'typical public-school man'. Party socialism was not to come for fifty years. These men were not sprinkling holy water over a people's party; they were working out the implications of a religion of love for the Church and nation and industry. It was leading them into co-operative co-partnership undertakings in a variety of trades, and after this gallant failure, into the sphere of working-class education. The working-men's college in North London remains a monument to their unquenchable zeal.

If they were not socialists in our sense of the word, they were emphatically not Liberal. For a larger part of the century, Liberalism was identified with *laissez-faire*, and in growing alliance with non-conformity swept away restrictions in religion, trade, and politics. The period of Bright and Gladstone had its own glories, but Gladstone confessed in later years that not only in the Tory ranks but even within his own party there was a social emphasis, alien to his tradition, and with which he had no sympathy. The contrast between Gladstone and Disraeli is in part the contrast between an individualism without a collectivist basis, and a collectivism which sought the people's favours without knowing the people's needs. Since those days Liberalism has moved on, and while its rallying call is still freedom and respect for the individual, it is ready to invoke State action whenever that is pragmatically justified. The Conservative Party, however, even more than the Liberal Party, has used the powers of the State with great willingness. Some of the most socialistic acts on the legislature have been passed by the Tories.

Toward the end of the century, a number of Socialist organizations arose with aims so similar that a later fusion was inevitable. It was somewhat like the many streams that ultimately join to make the one river.

The original impetus did not come from the Trade Unions. They were occupied with internal affairs and did not engage in political propaganda. The co-operative societies from whom much might have been expected were likewise wedded to liberalism. They did not discern the new signs of a new age. As in the case of other revolutions it was the intellectuals who first ploughed the ground and sowed the seed. The Socialist Democratic Federation (S.D.F.) rested on a hard dogmatic Socialism modelled on the Marx-Engels pattern of class war. There was no belief in parliamentary politics and no compromise with other reformist groups. The influence of the S.D.F. was immense because other thinkers were stimulated to present their own answers to the same set of problems. In 1883 the Fabian Society arose out of an earlier discussion-group, believing passionately in the power of reason. Alike, to influence

administrators, and to lighten dark places in public life, the Fabians gave themselves both to argument and to research.

In 1880 the dockers' strike was led most skilfully by Tom Mann, Ben Tillett, and John Burns, who struck for essentially modest and reasonable demands. 'A tanner an hour payment for overtime, and a minimum of four-and-a-half hours employment' were the main demands. In a month they had not only won their case but stimulated the growth of new unions, and revitalized existing ones. Trade Union councils were set up at many new centres and union membership soared to new heights. In 1890 the Liberal leaders were discomfited by a series of Socialist resolutions passed at the Trade Union Congress. Resolution is quicker and easier than revolution but not so lasting. It was primarily due to Keir Hardie that the heady enthusiasm of 1890 was utilized in the formation of an independent Labour Party (1893). One step remained. There was a paramount need to bring Socialism and Trade Unions in a firm alliance. In 1899 an all-important decision was taken and the Unions and socialistic societies combined to form Labour Representation Committees (L.R.C.). At the first conference (1900) three roads stretched ahead and one had to be chosen. John Burns would have liked Liberal-Labour collaboration; the S.D.F. contingent wanted a complete withdrawal both from Radicals and Trade Unions. The Independent Labour Party wanted an alliance not with the Liberals, nor even Radicals, but with the Trade Unions. The victory of the I.L.P. point of view was followed by intensive campaigning. The decision of the Taff Vale case horrified the Unions and caused them to subscribe still larger sums to the funds of the L.R.C. In these first years of the century Robert Blatchford, in the pages of the *Clarion*, was making untold numbers of the working class long for that 'Merrie England' which only Socialist legislation could achieve.

In 1906 twenty-nine seats were captured by L.R.C. candidates, and when the Miners' Federation instructed its 'Liberal-Labour' M.P.s. to join the new party, the number rose to forty. The Labour Party, as it was henceforward designated, had smitten the public mind like a thunder-clap on a Summer's day. Yet the moment of triumph was, in another aspect, a moment of eclipse. When Ramsay MacDonald replaced Keir Hardie as Chairman of the Parliamentary Labour Party, he, unlike the Victorian leader, wanted a close alliance with the Liberal Party. This policy was made more acceptable to his colleagues because Lloyd George was initiating a period of social reform that only ended with the first World War. Disraeli in a vivid phrase said of Sir Robert Peel that 'he caught the Whigs bathing, and walked away with their clothes'. In like manner Lloyd George stole Socialist thunder. His famous budget attacking land-owners, drew upon him the anger of the powerful. He could be complimented upon the enemies he had made. The progressives rallied to his support. The proposed assault upon the entrenched power of the Lords followed by the Parliament Act commanded the support of all Socialists. Measures such as Workmen's Compensation, Old Age Pensions, Unemployment and Health Insurance, the eight-hour day, a minimum wage for miners, and the payment of M.P.s—made it impossible for Socialists to dissociate themselves from so fruitful an alliance.

Yet all was not well. The Liberals had trodden a collectivist road but they

could not follow it to the end. Meanwhile economic grievances remained unredressed. The *Daily Herald*, started in 1912, enabled Socialist opinion to find independent expression. In the two years that remained before the deluge, the Syndicalists, inspired by French syndicalism, preached both in the *Daily Herald* and in the country at large a doctrine of aggregating power in large unions and then using that power ruthlessly. They seemed to be gaining ground and a Building Workers' Industrial Union was actually founded in 1914. Then came the War and Industrial Unionism was amongst its many casualties.

It was not until 1923 that the Labour Party gained sufficient seats to make a Socialist Government possible. If Asquith voted against the Tories, then the Labour Party could assume power, for in the election Conservatives had gained 258, Liberal 157, and Labour 192 seats. Lady Bonham Carter has shown how, despite the strongest pressure, Asquith remained true to his own convictions on the matter. He voted against the Tories and for the first time a Labour Government in 1924 came into office. It had from the start a tenuous hold on life, and since its principal members had leaned for so long upon the Liberals it pursued a course acceptable to that Party. Apart from John Wheatley's splendid Housing Act and a spirited foreign policy, the Government had not justified the hopes of millions. An unwise and soon-abandoned Government lawsuit, a hasty appeal to the nation, and the scare of the Zinoviev letter, were enough to cause the Government, like a torpedoed ship, to sink quickly beneath the waves.

Apart from the brief period of minority Government (1929-31) in which strongly founded hopes were blasted by the Wall Street crash, and its worldwide economic repercussions, the Labour Party had to wait until 1945 before it assumed an independent existence with a majority sufficient to carry out its promises. History will record how splendidly, despite conditions in a sick and weary and war-exhausted world, so many of those promises have been fulfilled. Many of the social measures for which reformers have toiled during long years, came at last to the Statute Book.

In the intellectual ferment stirred up by Fabians, S.D.F., Trade Unionism, and the Scottish Labour Party, the Churches had a part to play. The earlier Christian Socialists had been largely Tory in political sympathy. Their interest had been in industrial co-operative co-partnership enterprise and educational reform. Nevertheless, F. D. Maurice's *Kingdom of Christ* was a seminal book setting out Christianity in social terms. Books like *Yeast*, *Alton Locke*, and *The Water Babies*, had a social reference and called for social redress. The industrial production schemes rested on a socialist philosophy. Inevitably the second tidal wave of Christian Socialism overstepped the earlier limit.

It is generally agreed that the Guild of St Matthew founded by Stewart Headlam in the late seventies was the first Socialist organization under Christian inspiration and control. George Bernard Shaw, writing in a preface to his *Pleasant Plays*, said of this period that 'religion was alive again, coming back upon men, even clergymen, with such power that not even the Church of England itself could keep it out'.

Despite the enthusiasm of Headlam and the preaching ability and theological acumen of Hancock, the G.S.M. never caught the imagination of the workers, and many sympathizers felt that a change of tactics was needed. The

man in the pew must be courted with a less violent and more persuasive technique. In 1889 the Christian Social Union was founded with Henry Scott Holland as its guiding spirit. Headlam as a Prince Rupert of the cavalry could hardly hope to shake the convictions of Anglican leaders. Holland, Charles Gore, and E. S. Talbot, neither feared nor flouted authority, but they sought assiduously to bring the weight of episcopal power and theological learning behind the Christian claim for social justice. Maurice Reckitt has said that between 1889 and 1913 out of fifty-three episcopal appointments, sixteen went to members of the C.S.U. Through his community of the Resurrection at Mirfield, Gore sent out his Mirfield priests eager to apply a whole gospel to the whole of living. His later championship of the Church Socialist League (founded 1906), made the new effective spearhead of Anglican social thinking until the post-war years brought new agencies to bear upon a changing situation.

The ferment of socialist thinking in Church and State left Wesleyan Methodism curiously unaffected. *The Watchman* represented the official mind, and its attitude to the Christian Socialists was cautious and keenly critical. Kingsley's writings were attacked, and when after Kingsley had preached in a London Church, the incumbent came forward and strongly denounced what he had heard, *The Watchman* thoroughly approved his action. 'Mr Kingsley's false doctrines degrade our Lord into a Socialist model man.' Between 1848 and 1854 the Christian Socialists applied their principles to industry. They organized associations of working men in tailoring, building, and shoemaking, and allowed neither Capitalist employers nor shareholders. The workers chose their managers and divided up their own profits. The schemes failed financially. The true way forward was not the workers' control of management, but co-operation in consumption. The Rochdale Pioneers in their Toad Lane store (1844) had discovered this, and the co-operative movement resulted. Nevertheless, the associations adumbrated later schemes of profit-sharing and co-partnership and that emphasis on human values which is so marked a feature of modern industrial psychology.

As the century wore to its close the Radicals on the left flank of Liberalism increased in number. They wanted 'the intervention of the State on behalf of the weak against the strong, in the interest of Labour against Capital, and of want and suffering against luxury and ease'. Free education, small-holdings, graduated income tax, State provision of good houses for poor people, and the State purchase of land for public use, were all advocated. But while a Radical is a Liberal in battle dress, he is not a Socialist. Many Radicals did in fact join the Labour Party when it was formed, but more remained within the older Party and provided the backing for Lloyd George's social legislation of a later date.

In the Free Churches, Hugh Price Hughes, S. E. Keeble, Sylvester Horne, and John Clifford, were great leaders for Radical reform. Their work was contemporaneous with that second wave of Christian Socialism within the Anglican Church, and in a deep and real sense both movements were kindled at the same altar. There are indeed many parallels. Nevertheless, the Anglicans showed a lineal descent from the Christian Socialists of which the Free Churches could not boast. They were socialistic rather than radical in political

thinking, and their affinities were rather with the Trade Unions, the Fabians, and in time the Independent Labour Party.

Within Methodism this was only true of certain laymen. The *Methodist Times* (26th May 1890) said in a striking summary of Methodist representation in the Commons: 'The great majority of working men returned to Parliament are Methodists of a Methodist extraction. Think of Joseph Arch who spoke for the peasantry. Thomas Burt was of Methodist origin, and Mr Pickard representing the miners of York is a Methodist. Henry Broadhurst, the first workman to become a Member of Parliament is a hearty Wesleyan. The immense majority of Methodist people were his enthusiastic supporters.' The Labour Representation Committee had its Methodist leavening, but in the country at large and especially in the Trade Unions, laymen from every branch of the Methodist Churches were ready for a Labour Party and eager to declare their allegiance.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century there was unemployment, and deep, stark poverty, with no State provision for essential need. There was slum landlordism, sweated industries, and the grim struggle of Trade Unions against entrenched Capital. It was said that the Churches lifted up no hand to help the workers, but if the gibe had been wholly true then English Socialism like Continental Socialism might have been secular and anti-clerical. W. G. Symons wrote in a *Christian News Letter Supplement* (1941) 'one of the most distinctive facts about British working-class life has been its roots in Non-conformist Christianity. . . . The Labour Party, the Trade Unions, in their British form and a great part of democratic thought and effort have come from working-class non-conformity; however much they are now divorced from the life of their Churches, they still bear upon them the marks of their origin. It is just impossible to understand the British Labour movement or co-operative institutions without a knowledge of Methodism. We have in Great Britain what is perhaps unique in Christian history—a religious tradition which is native and indigenous to an industrial proletariat.' Mr W. G. Symons is right, and yet there is substance in the complaint heard last century and not unknown today. However, a section of the laity, and a few clergymen and Free Church ministers, spoke the needful word at the needful hour. They discerned the signs of the times. They wanted not only the removal of social wrongs but the creation of a just social order making it easier for men to live as the sons of God. The Church as a whole was not so sensitive and responsive. Within Methodism for example there was an evangelism which sought the conversion of the individual but was not so alive to the major ills of Society. It was to the everlasting credit of the few reformers that they saw and judged and acted. A great epochal movement was not left without Christian impulse and direction.

MALDWYN L. EDWARDS

THE PSALMS AND THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS

MORE URGENT problems there undoubtedly are, but none of more engrossing interest to Christians than those that meet us in our studies and inquiries in the life of Jesus. And in this field, none are more compelling than those that lead us to investigate the determinants of His conduct and the contributories to His faith. Absorbed as we are by His active ministry, we confess also the vast attraction of His 'hidden years'—the years from the age of twelve to the age of thirty, from which no voice has survived, no memory nor recollection concerning the Son of Man come down to us. There is a passion that moves us, not to be dismissed as curiosity, commensurate only with our love, to venture behind that curtain, to set foot in that holy place, to see a little if we can—to hear a little too—of the forces that made Him the man that He was when He stood beside the Baptist in the Jordan.

It is strictly in keeping with the simplicity of His life, with what we know as the ultimate simplicity of His character, that we should reduce these forces in the last analysis to two: to the power upon Him of the Hebrew Scriptures, and of His own life of prayer and communion with God. These two mingled inextricably in the life of the growing and accomplished man. No two streams flowing confluent toward the sea ever more effectually became one stream than these two in the mystery and enigma of His life. 'The Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth; what things soever he doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner' (John 5^{20, 19}). As to the Word of God, we have His own adult testimony to its place in His estimation. 'The scriptures', He said, '... they which bear witness of me' (John 5³⁹). And to the two on the way to Emmaus He expounded, with an eloquence that warmed their hearts, 'in all the scriptures the things concerning himself' (Luke 24²⁷). No less, in the Wilderness, before His ministry had well begun, He had pleaded against the enticements of the Evil One the plain commandments of the written Word. But this fixed relationship to our Old Testament was a thing already accomplished at the time of His Baptism, the result of His having listened, through the hidden years, to these Scriptures as they were never listened to before nor have ever been listened to since: the Eternal Word, Incarnate, responding to the ministry of the Prophetic Word. And without any possible doubt, the Prophetic Word was, as He grew, a positive contributory to His faith and a sharp determinant of His character and conduct.

How much, in all the crucial issues with which He had to deal, He was dependent upon His prayers with God, a single instance (and that the most dramatic and moving of them all) should convince us. When, by deliberate choice and loving care, He spent His last hour of freedom in prayer; when, in that prayer, He agonized more especially to know His Father's will; when, in that agony, He showed to His Father the cup pressed upon Him in the Prophetic Word, and pleaded by more than tears that it might pass from Him; when, in that pleading, He yet yielded to His Father's will a precedence before His own—then, if ever, He revealed to us the winepress He had been accustomed from His youth to tread: the sifting out, as it applied to Himself, of the written Word, in His communion with God. And it was out of this communion,

as out of many before, that He came resolute and self-controlled, to accomplish His Father's will.

We take it, from the two sayings quoted above, that He found the Scriptures most eloquent with regard to Himself. It was from them, primarily, that He gathered His astounding self-confidence: what He believed about Himself, He believed, ultimately, upon the testimony of these Scriptures. And in particular, the saying in St Luke makes it plain that when, time and again, He spoke to His disciples about His approaching death and resurrection, He was making known to them what the Scriptures had discovered to Him about Himself . . . that it 'behoved' Him to suffer, and to enter into His glory.

This 'entering into his glory' is a phrase that bears a larger connotation than we propose to inquire into at the present time. We are here concerned with His resurrection alone: with that act of God by which, the Incarnate Son having delivered Himself up to death, He was made the victor over death—that act of God by which, His enemies having brought Him to what they believed would be His end, the crucified Son was given a new and better beginning. And our question is—from what *Scripture* did Jesus, before this happened, draw His incontestable assurance that it would happen? *Where* in the Old Testament did He learn that it behoved Him, first, to suffer, and then, to enter into His glory?

It is not our intention, in this present inquiry, to cast a wide net—to scour the Scriptures for prophecies of this event. We shall confine ourselves to Scriptures distinguished by Jesus' own express regard. These, it happens, were all Psalms, and four in number. Three were quoted by Him, one to Him—all in such a way as makes it necessary now to understand that He had previously read them as addressed particularly to Himself.

First, then—during His Temptation in the Wilderness (Matthew 4¹⁻¹¹, Mark 1¹²⁻¹³, Luke 4¹⁻¹³), there was urged upon Him, in support of the temptation to cast Himself from the pinnacle of the Temple, the promise of Psalm 91: 'He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: And on their hands they shall bear thee up, Lest haply thou dash thy foot against a stone' (Matthew 4⁶). We are to remark that Jesus did not say—what He surely must have said if He had supposed it to be true—'But that Psalm was not written about me.' He accepted, and thereby confirmed, the Tempter's imputation of the Psalm to Himself. It is for this reason that we describe this Psalm as distinguished by the particular regard of the Saviour. For the Psalm is a unity, and prophetic of the Saviour not in this or that verse, but as a whole; and it was as a whole that Jesus read and accepted it. In the three closing verses, the Subject of the Psalm, having been previously described as divinely protected against all sorts of trouble, is found 'in trouble'; in His trouble calling upon God; answered and supported by God in the midst of His trouble; by God delivered out of His trouble, set on high, shown God's salvation exemplified in Himself, and satisfied with length of days.

To Jesus, 'troubled' by the enmity of the rulers of the Jews, and by their obvious resolve to be rid of Him; 'troubled' too by prophetic intimations of such suffering as laid upon Him from on high, was given this pledge that God would see Him *through* His trouble. We may regard this as tenuous and indefinite indeed, but what is the least that it must have meant to Him in such

circumstances? Surely that—the bitterness of death being past—God would justify and reward Him? And if we ask what such justification and reward must mean—precisely what must have been suggested to Him by the promise:

With long life will I satisfy him,
And shew him my salvation.

Surely, in the very nature of the case, it can have spelt nothing less than His resurrection from the grave? This was no instance of a desperate man clutching at straws. What we are uncovering is one of the major formative influences of His life. We know that already, when He was tempted in the Wilderness, He had taken this Psalm to His heart as 'concerning himself'. This, that He rested upon with so much resolution when put to the test, He had built upon long before His troubles had even begun. This Psalm, conned and prayed over, was one of the influences that brought Him to the Baptist in His prime, eager to set His feet upon the path that was to lead Him, through suffering, to His resurrection.

We must travel for our next two references to the last week of Jesus' earthly life, a week marked chiefly by recurrent public controversy with the rulers of the Jews. Up to this time, all that He had said about His resurrection He had said privately to His disciples. During this week He was twice to make public declaration of His faith—each time by implication, each time by quotation from the Psalms. This, in one sense delicate yet obviously deliberate procedure, was plainly one which was exquisitely suited to His situation. On the one hand, His faith in His own triumphant survival was, on two separate occasions, publicly proclaimed; on the other, it was proclaimed in such a way as to be explicit, at any time, only to men and women possessed of the secret of His own personal understanding of the Psalms. His public avowal of faith was, as we say, 'on record'; but its content was to be apparent only to those who might share His secret with Himself.

Let us turn, then, to the earlier of these two references: Matthew 21³³⁻⁴⁶, Mark 12¹⁻¹², Luke 20⁹⁻¹⁹. Here we have the parable of the Vicious Husbandmen, maltreating the servants and killing the son of their absent landlord, which closes with the question—answered in St Matthew by His hearers but in St Mark and St Luke by Jesus Himself: 'When therefore the lord of the vineyard shall come, what will he do unto those husbandmen?' (21⁴⁰). Each of the evangelists tells us that the chief priests and Pharisees understood that Jesus, in the parable, had been speaking about them. What is more to the point, at present, is to notice that in the quotation from the Psalms (118²²⁻³) with which he brought the occasion to a close he was *speaking about Himself*.

The Stone which the builders rejected,
The same was made the head of the corner:
This was from the Lord,
And it is marvellous in our eyes.

(Matthew 21⁴²)

The Psalm that He quoted to His challengers in this sense, must previously, in the same sense, have spoken to Him. That is to say that, in reading Psalm 118 He had believed Himself to be reading a Scripture 'concerning Himself'. It does not

matter that His immediate hearers missed the point of His quotation: it is His mind that we are concerned to read, not theirs. And His mind is here quite plain. This Psalm, full of triumphant praise to God for delivery from a multitude of foes, He had read as prophetic of His own destiny. And publicly He claimed it for His own. Rejected He already knew Himself to be, but He rested upon the promise of a restoration to a determinative place in God's handiwork. And since, in the context of His situation at that time, His rejection by the rulers of the Jews meant His *death*, His restoration by God could mean nothing less than His *resurrection*. We are taken, for one of the dazzling moments of the Gospels, behind the scenes. We are permitted to see, for once in a while, what it meant to Jesus to read the Psalms as the self-conscious Messiah. And thus it is given to us to appreciate, though only a very little, of the ministry of those Psalms upon His life. Long read, long pondered, long prayed over, they had enabled Him to realize and to consent to His Father's will, that through suffering He should enter into His glory: to plan and plot His path, by way of the Cross to the grave, and by way of the grave to His resurrection.

No less conclusive, in this sense, was His later quotation, within the same week, from Psalm 110 (Matthew 22⁴²⁻⁶, Mark 12³⁵⁻⁷, Luke 20⁴¹⁻⁴). It was this incident which, according to the Synoptists, brought to a close the long-drawn-out public debate between Jesus and the rulers of the Jews. Having turned back upon His questioners the intended barb of their inquiry about the Tribute Money, He asked them a question in turn: 'What think ye of the Christ? whose son is he?' They said: 'The son of David.' So then he asked them again: 'How then doth David in the Spirit call him Lord, saying,

The Lord said unto my Lord,
Sit thou on my right hand,
Till I put thine enemies underneath thy feet?

If David then calleth him Lord, how is he his son? And no one was able to answer him.'

We may admire, if we like, our Saviour's skill in controversy, and envy Him His power and conclusiveness in such debate. But this should not blind us to the obvious disadvantages under which His opponents wrought. They were accustomed to purely traditional modes of reading and interpreting their Scriptures, and sought to engage Him on their own familiar ground. But He stood on higher ground than they, understanding the Scriptures in a sense that was altogether peculiar, at that time, to Himself. In this particular instance His reading of the Psalm was radically affected by His faith in Himself as Messiah indeed, but as the incarnate Son of God as well—David's 'son' by descent and David's Lord by inherent right. This, which was then His exclusively personal faith, is our faith now, so that we are enabled, at least to some degree and by His help, to read the Jewish Scriptures with His eyes. But the rulers of the Jews had no inkling of His true identity, no remotest chance of understanding how their Scriptures spoke to Him. So, as was inevitable and in some sense necessary, He baffled them, meeting their attacks with a strategy which was new, attacking them in turn from ground of the very existence of which they were unsuspecting and not merely unaware.

But our chief interest, at this time, is not in the niceties of this debate. We

are absorbed by the mystery of our Lord's use of the Psalms, working only with evidence provided for us in the Gospels; and more particularly concerned with their share in ministering to Him His faith in His own eventual resurrection. That He accepted this Psalm, the 110th, as one that concerned Himself is plain from His use of it on this occasion, and we find it a Psalm that must have spoken to Him with satisfying clarity and force.

Its precise assurance is available to us only as we recollect once again the context of events, actual and threatened, in which He quoted it. David's 'Lord' is invited, in the Psalm, to share God's exaltation and power—bidden to sit at God's 'right hand'. This is the actual phrase in which the later New Testament describes the Saviour's present power and glory, to which He was exalted from the grave by His resurrection and ascension. Thus exalted, David's Lord was to see His enemies humbled before Him, and to enter upon an eternal priesthood, 'after the order of Melchizedek'. But the Jesus who quoted this Psalm to His enemies anticipated crucifixion at their hands within a few days of His reference to it. And this, His veiled taunt or answering threat, can only have been made in the faith that, having accomplished His death in obedience to His Father's will, He would be exalted by God's power to the glory He had shared with Him 'before the world was'. Who, then, can doubt the share which this very Psalm must have had in introducing that faith to His heart? Who can but wonder at the audacity with which, though in this veiled and indirect way, He challenged His intending destroyers, before their triumph, with His confidence in His own eventual exultant return? What Christian is there to whom this Psalm will not be endeared by the knowledge that it was one, amongst others, by which He was nourished toward His faith in His unique destiny and brought to consent to travel by way of the Cross to His resurrection?

The last of our references comes to us from the Cross itself (Matthew 27⁴⁶, Mark 15³⁴). Just before He died, out of the darkness that covered Him, at about three o'clock in the afternoon, Jesus was heard to cry aloud: 'Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?' This has long been known to us as His cry of Dereliction, the most painful and mysterious of all His words upon the Cross: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' There is an experience expressed and recorded in this cry which must remain for ever unshared, and for that reason beyond our understanding. The darkness there was more than physical. Jesus was then, at least for a while, strangely separated, no less from His Father than from ourselves. We say 'strangely', because at no other time was His obedience to His Father, or His identification with us, more thorough and complete. Strange indeed that in His final obedience he should feel Himself abandoned, that in His supreme act of fellowship He should discover Himself to be quite alone. Yet we should be grateful to know that this darkness was tinged with more than hope; that in this extremity of abandonment He found Himself sustained by the faith that had constrained Him thither. For this 'cry', spontaneous though it was, was not original; it was a quotation from one of the Psalms. And an examination of the Psalm suggests to us that what was, as to its naked content, a declaration of His abandonment, was at the same time a final proclamation of His long-cherished and invincible faith.

The Twentieth-second Psalm, of which the Cry of Dereliction comprises the opening verse, takes its place, by reason of this reference from the Cross, with

those we have already discussed as one which our Saviour accepted as 'concerning himself'. As with each of the others of this small group of Psalms, we accept the quotation of one verse or more as an indication that *the whole Psalm* was what interested and concerned Him. And—as we found in the case of Psalm 91—this Psalm, though a unity, is not simple but composite; painful and mysterious indeed: its pain the pain of unmerited suffering on the part of an elect servant of God; its mystery the supreme mystery of prophecy; its prophecy anticipatory not of pain alone but of justification and victory at last.

The composite nature of this Psalm is recognized in the printing of the English and other Revised Versions, in which we find a break at the close of verse 21 and a new beginning at the following verse. The first of the two sections of the Psalm, thus printed, is uncannily anticipatory of our Lord's Passion on the Cross.

¹A reproach of men, and despised of the people.

²All they that see me laugh me to scorn:

They shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying,

³Commit thyself unto the Lord; let him deliver him :

Let him deliver him, seeing he delighteth in him.

¹⁴I am poured out like water,

And all my bones are out of joint:

My heart is like wax;

It is melted in the midst of my bowels.

¹⁵My strength is dried up like a potsherd;

And my tongue cleaveth to my jaws;

And thou hast brought me into the dust of death.

¹⁶The assembly of evil-doers have inclosed me;

They pierced my hands and my feet.

¹⁷I may tell all my bones;

They look and stare upon me:

¹⁸They part my garments among them,

And upon my vesture do they cast lots.

Out of what actual experience the Psalm was written we shall never know, but it is impossible to read it now without some visualization of our Lord upon His Cross. Before He had been brought to it, He had recognized it as His lot; had 'consented' to it in the lowliness of His heart, even to being brought 'into the dust of death'. And by His cry, out of the darkness, almost in the moment of dissolution, He proclaimed that this Scripture was being fulfilled in Him. But this Scripture was, as we have said, not simple but composite. Its first part of suffering and death is completed by a second part of contentment and praise.

²²I will declare thy name unto my brethren:

In the midst of the congregation will I praise thee.

²³Ye that fear the Lord, praise him;

All ye the seed of Jacob, glorify him;

And stand in awe of him, all ye the seed of Israel.

²⁴For he hath not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted;

Neither hath he hid his face from him;

But when he cried unto him, he heard.

*⁷All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord:
And all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.

*⁸A seed shall serve him;
It shall be told of the Lord unto the next generation.

*⁹They shall come and shall declare his righteousness
Unto a people that shall be born, that he hath done it.

'A SEED shall serve him.' This also Jesus had read as 'concerning himself'; had long taken it to His heart as prophetic of His final destiny. 'Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit' (John 12²⁴). So that when we hear this cry from the Cross, and remember the *whole* of the Psalm of which it is the opening verse, that cry becomes not merely a cry of dereliction but a triumphant challenge to all the Powers of Darkness. By that cry, in that moment, He shook out again, in the very face of Death, the folds of the flag of His invincible faith. Vain were it indeed to suppose that His faith deserted Him just when He needed it most; a faith not self-conceived but ministered to Him through the Word of God, now made to Him a rod and staff of comfort in the Valley of the Shadow of Death. Long read, long pondered, long prayed over, long believed in, long consented to, and now rested upon: proclaimed 'with a loud voice' at the very entrance to the grave, and thus made a means of declaring His faith unshaken in His approaching resurrection.

Prophecy, we know, is something more extensive in the Old Testament than the writings of those whom we know as the Prophets. There is Prophecy in the Psalms, and Messianic Prophecy above all else. Here, in the hidden years of His life, the Saviour found Himself portrayed, His path plotted, His passion and glory foretold. And we owe it to God and to Him to remember that He became the Man whom we have learned to adore and to obey in part because of the ministry of these Psalms. They spoke, in Him, to an open ear, a submissive will, an obedient heart. Treading them in the winepress of His communion with God He found Himself constrained along the path that led Him, through the bitterness of death, to the glory and wonder of His resurrection.

REGINALD GLANVILLE

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF MAN

A new and important book by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D., has just been published. Its title is *The Bible Doctrine of Man* (The Epworth Press, 18s. 6d.), and it is the forerunner of other volumes on Sin, Grace, and the Hereafter. These books are already partly written, and will be published as soon as possible. Meanwhile we are happy to announce that the Rev. Wilbert F. Howard, M.A., D.D., F.B.A., has promised to review Dr Ryder Smith's book in our next issue.

L. F. C.

UNSCIENTIFIC REFLECTIONS ON THE NEW COSMOLOGY

*Then felt I like some watcher of the skies
When a new planet swims into his ken. . .*

THAT WOULD be but a mild sensation to hearers or readers of Mr Fred Hoyle's Lectures in *The Nature of the Universe*. Under his guidance (or that of Sir Arthur Eddington on *The Expanding Universe*) we have become accustomed to a Universe of innumerable galaxies, of which our own starry heavens with their 'Milky Way' are but one. Few of us are qualified to judge of the scientific case presented. The mathematical calculations and inspired guesses are far beyond us. But the astronomers have condescended to our low estate, and have tried to give us, by comparison and symbol, a picture we can understand. So we are entitled to reflect, in an unscientific way, upon their findings, and to ask what is the bearing of all this upon life and religion. We are entitled to ask, in particular, whether Mr Hoyle's conclusions in the last Lecture of the series really follow from all that he has told us in the earlier ones. Many must have felt that they do not; that there is here a perceptible break—a step down from assured mastery, in a realm where Mr Hoyle moves with unerring tread, to a level of reasoning hardly worthy of him.

To begin, then, with the last lecture, entitled *Man's Place in the Universe*. In slightly varying terms Mr Hoyle denies that we have any real knowledge of this. 'We have no clue to the answers to questions such as these' (namely, why there is such a Universe as this at all), he says; and, in the very impressive closing sentence of the book: 'Perhaps the most majestic feature of our whole existence is that while our intelligences are powerful enough to penetrate deeply into the evolution of this quite incredible Universe, we still have not the smallest clue to our own fate.'

It is perhaps unfair to take an author to task for the appearance of dogmatism in such a short work. But it must be said that such statements are both dogmatic and unpalatable. Surely we have many clues—though it may be a matter for debate whether or no they suffice to unravel the mystery. Mr Hoyle may perhaps only mean that within his own field of study, or among the facts set forth in his book, there is no clue. Even this may be questioned, as we shall contend; but admitting so much for the moment, we must ask, Why limit ourselves to such huge and distant fields when we are searching for clues as to man's place in the Universe? We have to accustom ourselves in this modern world to studies that range from the incredibly minute to the incredibly vast. The intermediate ranges of experience are apt to be lost sight of. It is as though men's eyes are so much glued to the eyepieces of microscopes and telescopes that they become unaccustomed to ordinary-scale vision. Thus to offer even a sketch of an essay on 'Man's Place in the Universe' based entirely upon a study of such vast and remote phenomena as stars and galaxies is unreasonable. Even the Universe has not been fully studied so long as we confine our attention to such distant perspectives. Such clues as we can observe are likely to lie nearer at hand. In particular, there must be some study of Man himself, his nature and

capabilities, and his history, before we can say there is no clue to his place in this Universe.

But when we turn from the Universe to Man, can we still say there is no clue? The very sentence in which Mr Hoyle affirms this seems itself to contain one. 'Our intelligences are powerful enough to penetrate deeply into the evolution of this quite incredible Universe,' he says. This *human knowledge* seems in itself to suggest that man's place can be no insignificant one. Mr Hoyle is surely himself as great a portent in his own way as an exploding supernova! It might well be said of us as of the villagers of Auburn that

*Still they gazed, and still the wonder grew,
That one small head could carry all he knew.*

Here is the brain of an astronomer: a very complex arrangement of matter. It is utterly incommensurable, as to size, with, say, the Galaxy in Andromeda. Yet it may well be compared with the galaxy in importance and significance; for in this brain, or in close connexion with it, is taking place the unique phenomenon called *knowing*. Mr Hoyle knows a great deal about the galaxy; there seems no reason to think that the galaxy knows anything of Mr Hoyle, or even of itself or its fellows. Is not this 'one up to' Mr Hoyle, and therefore to the genus *Homo Sapiens*?—for of course, though we did nothing to further his researches, we are proud to claim him as one of ourselves, and to be able to speak with that comfortable plural of what 'we' have discovered about the Universe. There seems to be no possibility that the point of that old *bon-mot* about astronomy will ever be turned aside: 'Astronomically considered, man is—the astronomer!' Every advance in man's understanding of the Universe must enhance the status of man. If there is no Divine consciousness, it would seem that the Universe attains to awareness of itself only in man's knowledge. That fact is itself surely a 'clue'.

But it is far from being the only clue. To refer to the findings of one who is hardly an orthodox Christian, Dr Kenneth Walker showed in his book *Diagnosis of Man* that a careful study of man's psycho-physical nature, and of his spiritual adventures in the great religions of the world, may yield many 'clues' as to the meaning of his existence. Again, Professor Toynbee's monumental studies show that in man's history many 'clues' may be found. To examine them in detail would lead us far from Mr Hoyle's lectures. It is sufficient to mention them, to remind ourselves that when Mr Hoyle says 'We have not the slightest clue', he has not looked very far. Before one could assent to such a statement, it would be necessary to range all the fields of man's intellectual, aesthetic, and moral experience, and find them all barren of 'clues'. There may be men who have done this; but they would not make very good detectives.

Christians will next join issue with Mr Hoyle upon his criticisms of Christian Doctrine.

His first, and most amazing, argument in the attack on religion is as follows. Pointing to the vast superiority of 'the New Cosmology' over the cosmology implied in the Bible, he asks: 'Is it in any way reasonable to suppose that it was given to the Hebrews to understand mysteries far deeper than anything I can

comprehend, when it is quite clear that they were completely ignorant of many matters that seem commonplace to me?" There, surely, speaks modern man at his most arrogant. Technical progress has placed in his possession such a mighty implement as the Mount Wilson telescope; the cumulative development of mathematical knowledge has enabled him to use it to magnificent effect. In consequence he claims that in every kind of insight he must be equally in advance of all previous generations. Does it follow that every modern sculptor could teach Phidias something, because he happens to have more kinds of stone at his disposal? Or that because the modern architect has far vaster technical resources, he must in every way outstrip William of Sens? It seems the twentieth century has written its own theme-song:

*Anything you can do, I can do better!
I can do everything better than you!*

No such conclusions follow, of course. Knowledge and wisdom are by no means the same thing. Lord Russell, in a recent speech, said that this generation, for all its knowledge, is very deficient in wisdom. To many it will seem by no means impossible that there is some wisdom in the religious literature of mankind that has escaped Mr Hoyle. It may even be that David, gazing into the starry sky with no modern telescope to help him, and equipped only with astronomical ideas we now know to be hopelessly incommensurate with the facts, yet 'caught the spirit' of the Universe more certainly than we. Indeed, the experience of the present generation seems to show that the onset of new knowledge is more than likely to upset for a time that poise and mental balance that is essential to true wisdom.

The attack on the Christian doctrine of the future life follows equally strange paths. Mr Hoyle's knowledge of the Christian position appears to be based on Handel's use of a text from the book of Job, whose meaning many scholars would hold to be quite different from what Handel took it to be. But that is beside the main point. The main argument turns on the curious assumption that eternity means time indefinitely prolonged. This is not the only respect in which Mr Hoyle's attack on Christian orthodoxy seems to be as wide of the mark as would be an attack on his own views that assumed them to be based on Aristotelian physics. It is always a good idea, when attacking someone's beliefs, to find out what they are. Mr Hoyle assumes that Christians believe that they will survive death, and then go on living for ever, experiencing the passage of time as they now do, but doing nothing in particular. This, he rightly claims, would be a crashing bore. He himself would certainly wish to live longer than we usually do—perhaps three hundred years or so; but beyond this, he says, the limitations of which he is already too well aware, would become intolerable. And it is useless for Christians to say they will be removed, for that, he claims, would mean we would be no longer ourselves.

Taking this last point first, it is difficult to see what kind of limitations are meant; and the argument really seems to require that this question should never be asked, for a confusion is its essential basis. If *moral* limitations—faults of character—are meant, then to remove them does not destroy the real self, but integrates and reveals it. Christians believe themselves 'called to be saints';

their true self is the self God destines them to be. Each 'limitation' upon this self that is shed in *this* life means a new liberation. That this process should continue is something we confidently hope. The removal of *intellectual* limitations, again, is an exhilarating process, and affords no ground for Mr Hoyle's argument. Did he feel less *himself* when he first mastered the calculus? But perhaps he means the limitations which are essential to human personality as we know it; the bounds which mark off Brown from Robinson; the characteristics and individualities that make each man *himself* and not another. From the removal of these, however, Mr Hoyle does not seem to shrink. What he would like after death seems to imply such a self-transcendence. There is a point of contact here with many mystics, of course, and Mr Hoyle's hopes may not be so far from some Christians' as he thinks. Others would contend, however, that it is precisely these 'limitations' that are *not* irksome. Indeed, they are not 'limitations' in any fettering sense. They are simply the boundary-marks of each human personality, which is one of the precious things most of us would wish to see 'treasured up unto a life beyond life'.

Indeed, so too, it appears, would Mr Hoyle. For in an engaging paragraph he tells us what kind of a future life he would like: namely one on which we were able 'to share the consciousness' of some of the truly great. 'What I would choose would be an evolution of life whereby the essence of each of us becomes welded together into some vastly larger and more potent structure.' He believes that 'such a dynamic evolution would be more in keeping with the grandeur of the physical Universe than the static picture offered by more formal religion'.

This raises two questions. The first is, whether it would be desired to include the 'essence' of Nero, Caesar Borgia, Hitler, and Al Capone, in the celestial amalgam? This raises the problem of the sinful personality, and of the sin in every human personality: a problem with which only Christianity seriously comes to grips. The second is, whether the 'essence' of anyone can really be conceived except in terms of personality. What is 'the consciousness of Shakespeare' apart from Shakespeare? Mr Hoyle here falls into the error so common among scientists, of treating human personality in sub-personal terms. He would doubtless pour scorn on the 'anthropomorphic' language of the Bible in some places; yet he speaks of spiritual being in terms that are (if the term may be permitted) 'hylomorphic', as though it were something that could be 'welded' and amalgamated into an impersonal mass. Now here on earth we know of two kinds of union between persons: there is the 'welding' kind, as seen in totalitarian states (e.g. the 'Hitler Youth'), in which individuality is ground down, and a 'mass-mind' is produced; and there is the kind seen in a perfect friendship or marriage, where personality is heightened by the union, and each is more himself as he lives in the other. Christians look to the latter for their analogy of Heaven. This leads to a 'Realm of Ends' rather than the psychic mass to which Mr Hoyle's language could point. With the thought of bliss through union with greater persons than himself, however, the Christian is in sympathy. With him, the greatest hope is for union not only with others, but with God himself. He is a little astonished to learn that this is something 'static', as opposed to Mr Hoyle's heaven, which is 'dynamic'; for he was being criticized only a little earlier for expecting a future life in endless time,

which Mr Hoyle could not bear. His true hope is for what might be called 'arrival'. Time passes into Eternity, when we behold Him

*In the clear vision and aspect of whom
All longings and all hopes shall be fulfilled.*

Not all that Mr Hoyle has to say is uncongenial to Christians, however. He stands far from the older materialism, and his criticism of it will refresh many. There is hope, too, in that he finds his own conclusions about man's place in the Universe depressing. He speaks of 'the truly dreadful situation in which we find ourselves', and admits: 'I do not like the situation any better than they do' (i.e. religious people). Such despair is near to hope; for, as he himself sees, humanity simply will not rest in such a position. Lord Russell's 'firm foundation of unyielding despair' can never support any abode of the soul but a prison-house. We simply *must* find something better. The simile of the mountaineers (on page 116) seems to require only a little adjustment to fit the facts perfectly. It is surely Mr Hoyle himself who is 'crag-fast'. He does not indeed shout 'I'm safe!' but 'I'm stuck—and I don't like it!' The materialist has decided the summit cannot be scaled, and there is no way but downward. The religious man is determined to press onward and upward, not rashly disregarding the precipices (as Mr Hoyle asserts), but taking the risks in faith, as every enterprise demands. No mountaineer would get far, who was never prepared to make a leap across a gully, or go hand over hand along a ledge. No broad and noble view of man's place and calling in this world was ever yet reached without some leaps in faith, some holy boldness. The mountaineering picture is apt in this: that there is no way save up or down. Mr Hoyle, sitting on his crag, is the symbol of his generation. Their choice cannot be long delayed.

All the foregoing, however, has been concerned with the last few pages of the lectures, where the author would not claim to be a specialist, but an amateur (where philosophy and theology are concerned) assessing the impact of his own cosmological conclusions. In the earlier lectures, on the other hand, he is the expert, who pilots us through the vast complexities of his subject with assured ease. Here he does not often intrude his own views on religion, and we are free to feel upon our own faith the full impact of the wonders he unfolds. Readers of Jeans and Eddington are partly prepared for these wonders. They have grown accustomed to hearing of millions of light-years, and custom creates the illusion of comprehension. Here a line of development in astronomy is completed, and the whole picture is sketched for us with consummate skill. And what a picture! Any man who can claim that he is not in some measure shaken by it is either grossly insensitive or a hypocrite. It would be rash to attempt to summarize so lucid and brief a work; instead, we will confine ourselves to a few comments on the bearing of this 'New Cosmology' upon religious faith.

To the reader who believes in God, the first impulse must be overwhelmingly toward reverence and awe. Such a note even creeps into the author's rather confident voice at times, as when he finds the galaxy seen through the constellation Andromeda 'one of the most impressive of astronomical objects'. The

photograph that accompanies the description (when we see it in the light of the facts and figures we have been given) reveals these words, and any possible words, to be wholly inadequate. And when, in the last Lecture, it is suggested that such galaxies (of which our own 'Milky Way' is one) may well be members of an endless procession, perpetually arising, and perpetually receding into unfathomable space (in the course of ten thousand million years or so!), the mind reels at the thought. But for the believer, the words of the Psalmist have taken a new significance:

When I consider the heavens, the work of Thy hands . . .

Perhaps the greatest surprise in the book is the confident calculation that in every galaxy of this endless procession, including our own, there may well be 1,000,000 planets sufficiently similar to the earth to support life. Mr Hoyle is confident that in the galaxy we see as the 'Milky Way', in which our sun and all the other stars we see are situated, there are not less than 10,000 such planets at the least. Not long ago, we were being assured that our little earth might well be unique in all the starry heavens. Now we learn that it is probably one of an almost infinite number—indeed, a literally infinite series, according to this author. To the unscientific reader, the calculations upon which this view is based will seem very precarious. The argument seems to rest upon a statement of statistical probability derived from one observed (the only observable) instance. Even more difficult is it to find ground for the confidence that granted such planets, 'life would in fact arise', or that, if this were so, forms of life something like man would probably evolve. Words such as 'likely' and 'probably' seem to have assumed a new meaning here. Here is a succession of prodigious leaps. Moreover, no direct test of the truth or falsity of the conclusion seems likely ever to be possible. But suppose this shot has in fact hit the mark. What is its bearing on religious faith? *

Clearly, we are not so important as we thought! Not only is our little earth the merest speck in space: it is one of myriads of such inhabited specks! Not only is the individual man lost in the long stream of life on his own planet; that stream itself is one of myriads of such streams! The thought is staggering. And yet one may wonder which picture upon the whole would better accord with the faith of a Christian: the unique speck all but lost in so vast a system, seeming to be a cosmic accident or freak; or the endless stream of such worlds, seeming to show that their existence is an essential feature of the Universe, throwing light upon its meaning. The latter seems preferable. It shows us a fountain of Creative activity (dare we say, Creating Love?) that has *never* been quiescent, and never will be.

*God's great goodness aye endureth,
Deep His wisdom passing thought:
Splendour, light, and life attend Him,
Beauty springeth out of naught.
Evermore
From His store
New-born worlds rise and adore.*

(How strangely again and again in the light of 'the New Cosmology' the hyperbole of devotional language assumes the aspect of sober fact!)

But the obvious question must arise: Amid such an endless procession, must not any single member be quite insignificant? Still more, on any one planet must not even our civilizations and histories, leave alone our single lives, be utterly without significance? Here is how Mr Hoyle sees it: 'When I was at school, I learnt history in such a way as to think a period of a century or two was a very long time. It came as a great shock to realize later that the real history of man must be measured not in centuries but in tens and perhaps in hundreds of thousands of years. But even this is only the briefest tick of the clock compared with the ages of the rocks in your garden and the stars in the sky. . . .'

Most of us have experienced this 'shock' at some stage or other in our education. But mature reflection has perhaps somewhat mitigated it. For a fallacy lurks in this argument. What, precisely, is meant by 'real'? Why is the natural history of man, extending perhaps over 100,000 years, more 'real' than recorded history, the history of civilizations, covering only six thousand or so?

*One glorious hour of crowded life
Is worth an age without a name!*

Significance is not to be measured by size or duration. There may be more real history in a few years that are packed with significant development than in whole aeons. A fossilized wasps' nest exists that is probably eighty million years old—far older than mankind! Have wasps therefore more 'real history' than man? On the contrary, there is a 'natural history' of the wasp, but no *real* history at all. Man's short sojourn, by contrast, is surely vastly more significant. It is not time's length, but what fills time, that counts. Indeed, the whole conception of time as an endless, even flow, is highly misleading. We automatically assume that 'a year' was just as long before there were men to live through it as it is now; but *to whom* was it as long? Which is longer: the eight hours we spend asleep, or the fifteen minutes of a Beethoven Sonata? And which is more of the stuff of 'real history'?

Lurking behind this fallacy is another. We have already seen how Mr Hoyle glues his eye to the telescope, and, with his gaze firmly fixed on the galaxy in Andromeda, shouts that we have 'no clue' to the meaning of existence, when in fact clues lie all about us within the life of man and his history (his *real* history, since the dawn of civilization!). The fact is, all our observations whatsoever must be made from a particular point or area in space and time—and the more distant the phenomena we observe, the vaster they must be for us to see them at all, and *the less detail we can see*. Thus significance may well be lost to us, the farther off in space and time we are gazing. We can see the galaxy in Andromeda (with the aid of a colossal telescope); but not the individual stars; still less the planets, at whose existence we arrive only by analogical and statistical reasoning; still less the life on those planets; and so on. Yet if we were on one of those planets, we might well find as rich and significant a pattern of life as here upon our own. We are like small creatures on a very large carpet. Immediately around ourselves we can see a pattern in detail. A little farther off, we can see no pattern. Does it follow that the pattern we see is illusory? We cannot see, through a telescope, good and evil, or love, or redemption, on

another planet: does it follow that they are not there? Or that they are not here? Similarly, when we look back through aeons of time, we can only discern the large-scale phenomena of the geological ages. We are not equipped to discern significance there. We are equipped to respond to the purpose and pattern we find in the stretch of space and time our finite minds can grasp. The studies of a Toynbee will give us more guidance than those of a Hoyle, though we must turn away from neither. The Psalmist was following a sound line of thought when he reasoned—or rather, when his devotional insight told him—that the God he knew within his own sphere of life would be with him in any imaginable sphere, however remote:

*If I climb up into heaven, thou art there:
if I go down into hell, thou art there also.
If I take the wings of the morning:
and remain in the uttermost parts of the sea;
Even there also shall thy hand lead me,
and thy right hand shall hold me.*

Such confidence outruns any past or possible experience. Is it, then, mere poetical hyperbole? Or is it a true faith that something we find *here* would be found anywhere—if we were to go there? *But we cannot discern it from here.*

Why do we so readily assume that on other planets, in other parts of the Universe, there might be life and knowledge analogous to our own, but not goodness, not love? Why do the fantastic nightmares of a Wells seem even plausible to us? Might it not even be that there were beings in other worlds as far beyond us in godlike splendour of moral achievement as we (our saints at least) are beyond the Anthropoid apes? If imagination is to be allowed to riot, why always imagine horrors? But above all, whether we follow H. G. Wells or C. S. Lewis, let us recognize that they *are* only imagining! Our only clues will be found in the pattern we can discern, and it will not be surprising if we discern it best in our more immediate environment.

*With the ambiguous earth
His dealings have been told us. These abide:
The signal to a maid, the human birth,
The lesson, and the young Man crucified.*

*. . . But, in the eternities,
Doubtless we shall compare together, hear
A million alien Gospels, in what guise
He trod the Pleiades, the Lyre, the Bear.*

*O be prepared, my soul:
To read the inconceivable, to scan
The million forms of God those stars unroll
When, in our turn, we show to them a Man.¹*

G. THACKRAY EDDY

¹ *Poems of Alice Meynell*, p. 92.

DOGMA OF THE ASSUMPTION

Considered in the Light of the Recent Papal Bull

WHEN PIUS the Ninth on 8th December 1854, solemnly enthroned in St Peter and wearing the tiara, defined the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, the growth of Mariolatry received an impulse which can only be compared, on dogmatic importance, with the definition of the '*Theotokos*' (Mother of God) made at the Council of Ephesus in 431.

As a matter of fact, within less than a hundred years from the time of Pius the Ninth a new dogma has been proclaimed: the dogma of the corporal assumption of Mary, which is the logical consequence of the Immaculate Conception.

Let us examine this new dogma in the light of Roman Catholic writings and especially of the bull of Pius the Twelfth defining the Assumption of Mary.

THE MEANING OF DOGMA IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

According to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, dogma is a revealed divine truth, which all Christians are obliged to believe, contained in the Sacred Scriptures (Old and New Testaments) or in the Apostolic tradition, because God has revealed it and the Church, through its universal and infallible teacher, wisely proclaims it as an object of faith.

THE EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT TESTIMONY OF THE SCRIPTURES

All serious Roman Catholic theologians admit that there are no direct or explicit references to the Assumption of Mary in the Scriptures. It is enough to note that not even the papal bull has been able to rest its dogmatic definition on a single verse from the Bible. Yet in the bull we find such affirmations as these: 'Among theological scholars are not lacking those who, wanting to grasp more fully the revealed truth and to show the agreement between theological reasoning and faith, pointed out that this privilege of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary is in admirable accord with the truths taught in the Sacred Scriptures'; and a little farther on: 'All these reasons and considerations of the Holy Fathers and of Theologians have as their ultimate foundation the Sacred Scriptures, which present to us the "*alma*" Mother of God closely united to her divine Son and always sharing his lot.' Before the end the papal bull once more asserts that 'the truth of the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary to Heaven, is a truth based on the Sacred Scriptures'.

How can the bull speak of 'admirable accord with the truths taught in the Sacred Scriptures', of 'considerations which have as their ultimate foundation the Sacred Scriptures', of 'a truth based on the Sacred Scriptures'?

We need to remember that for Roman Catholic theologians revealed truth can be explicitly or implicitly contained in the Scriptures. Not being able to find a single explicit or direct reference they have attempted—as in the case of many other dogmas—to rest their claim on the 'implicit' revelation. That this is nothing more than an attempt is revealed by the way the bull refers to the 'implicit' revelation: 'Then, frequently, one comes across theologians and religious orators who, following in the footsteps of the Holy Fathers, in order to illustrate their faith in the Assumption use, with a certain liberty, facts and

sayings from the Sacred Scriptures.' It is enough to examine even only superficially these 'facts and sayings from the Sacred Scriptures' to be more than convinced that the phrase 'with a certain liberty' is, to say the least, a little too amiable. It would be far truer to say: with a certain arbitrariness.

Here, then, are the passages quoted in the dogmatic bull, not as direct evidence—there is not even a shadow of direct evidence—but as examples of the illustrations used by 'theologians and religious orators'.

First we have a quotation from Psalm 32^a:

Arise, O Lord, into thy resting place;
Thou, and the ark of thy strength.

In the 'ark' these theologians and religious orators see 'an image of the very pure body of the Virgin Mary, preserved in the sepulchre from corruption and elevated to so great a glory in heaven'. Then after a passing reference to Psalm 45^{10, 14-16} mention is made of the 'Bride' of the Song of Songs, 'who . . . cometh up out of the wilderness like pillars of smoke, perfumed with myrrh and frankincense' to be crowned (3^a). This 'Bride' naturally is indicated 'as a picture of that celestial Queen and Bride, who with the divine Bridegroom is lifted to the royal palace of heaven'. Finally the bull, after referring to the 'Woman arrayed with the sun' of Revelation (12¹) and after mentioning the well-known passage in Luke (1²⁸) cites—recalling a homily made by St Anthony of Padua on the occasion of the feast of the Assumption—the words of Isaiah (60¹³): 'I will make the place of my feet glorious,' affirming that, 'with this we see clearly that the Blessed Virgin has been assumed with the body in which rested our Lord's feet'.

None of these passages (except Luke 1²⁸, with its well-known meaning) have even the remotest hint to Mary. They only give us a painful proof of the absurdities to which an artificial and allegorical interpretation of biblical passages will lead.

It is clear, therefore, that not even 'implicit' proof for the new dogma can be found in the Scriptures. The affirmations on the subject which we find in the bull have a definitely biased accent and do not carry conviction.

THE APOSTOLIC TRADITION

Though there are no direct or indirect biblical references there ought, at least, to be ample proof for the new dogma in the Apostolic Tradition. But here also we find no reference to the Assumption and only a passing reference to Mary herself. In Acts (1¹⁴) we read: 'These all with one accord continued stedfastly in prayer, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren'; and after this brief reference the name of Mary is not mentioned again in the Acts of the Apostles, nor does it appear in the Epistles of Paul, of Peter, of John, or of James. In Christian writings before the middle of the second century there is an unbroken silence concerning Mary, except for Ignatius of Antioch, who mentions her name a few times. Nothing is said of her by Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Policarp, Hermas, Theophilus, Tatian, Athenagoras, nor are there any references in the Didache or in the Epistle of Diognetus.

It is only toward the end of the fourth century that Mariolatry begins to

assert itself, in spite of many and authoritative protests. Epiphanius wrote: 'One must not honour the saints more than it is right, but we must honour their Lord. Mary as a matter of fact is not God, nor has she received her body from heaven.' Cyril also protests: 'We have not deified her who must be reckoned as other creatures. We know that she belongs to humanity as we do.'

The Roman Church is unable to find any solid ground on which to base its claims for the Assumption either in the Holy Scriptures or in the Apostolic Tradition. We have to wait until toward the end of the sixth century, when the feast of the '*Transitus*' or '*Kōimesis*' first makes its appearance, to find indications of the coming belief.

THE TRADITION OF THE CHURCH

After the Apostolic Tradition the bull turns to another tradition: the Tradition of the Church. Traces of this tradition are everywhere in the papal bull. First it mentions the witness of countless temples and works of art dedicated to God in honour of the Virgin Mary Ascended to Heaven. One fails to see how works of art, whether temples or pictures—undoubtedly of great artistic value and whether by Tiepolo or Tintoretto, by Masolino or Pinturicchio, by Titian or Beato Angelico, by Correggio or Donatello, can be quoted as proof for the promulgation of a dogma. Either the dogma is based on spiritual truth, and then the works of art will try to represent in visible form that truth; or the dogma is not based on spiritual truth, and then the works of art will be the representation of a fable or the representation of a popular credence.

It has never been heard that the consent of artists in representing a fable or in giving pictorial or architectural expression to a legend can then become a proof for turning a fable into a dogma, a popular credence into an article of faith.

The second source of evidence in this connexion quoted by the dogmatic bull is the liturgy: 'But in a more splendid and universal manner this belief of the holy Pastors and of the faithful Christians is manifested in the fact that from antiquity in the East and in the West a solemn liturgical feast is celebrated.' We know, however, that the 'antiquity' mentioned so emphatically, but so vaguely, stops at the fifth century. Jigie, a learned French Roman Catholic writer, says: 'Perhaps at the end of the fourth century, and certainly at the beginning of the fifth, in a few churches in the East and in the West a beginning is made to honour Mary with a public service and with a special feast.' It is not until the second half of the sixth century that the liturgy contains the feast of the '*Transitus*' or of the '*Kōimesis*', which can in any way be considered as heralding the Assumption.

The dogmatic bull affirms that 'the liturgy does not create the faith, but assumes it'; and so it ought to be. But it is well known how the liturgy of the '*Transitus*' or '*Kōimesis*' of Mary is the result of apocryphal stories and legends which flourished in the fifth century: stories and legends which Pope Gelasius definitely condemned toward the end of the fifth century, but which sprang up again and more plentifully than ever in the second half of the sixth century. These stories and legends are extremely fanciful and often contradictory, but they expressed popular religious feelings.

The line of dogmatic development in the Roman Church is always the same: first, popular religious feelings, then the worship, next comes theology which

explains and justifies the cult and, finally, the dogma, which all true believers must accept.

'PRINCIPLES' IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MARIOLATRY

We may well ask: what then are the positive grounds for the Roman Catholic dogma of the Assumption of Mary body and soul to heaven?

After a careful reading of this 'venerable and solemn Document' we find little but vague, emphatic, and problematic declarations; it seems impossible that so formidable a claim could be built on such flimsy evidence.

What is not explicitly stated in the dogmatic bull we find fully and clearly expressed by certain eminent Roman Catholic writers, especially by Father Roschini in his Marian Catechism, 'Who is Mary?' (*Chi è Maria?*) This able and clear writer sums up the rules in the development of Mariology by propounding a theory of 'principles': a 'primary principle' and four 'secondary principles'.

The 'primary principle' is that of her divine motherhood. 'Most Blessed Mary is the Mother of God.' This principle, according to Roschini, is explicitly taught in the Gospel! Once this is admitted, the four 'secondary principles' follow: 'uniqueness', 'fitness', 'eminence', and 'analogy with Christ.'

It is hardly necessary to point out that the Gospel does not contain either direct or indirect reference to 'Mary Mother of God' and therefore Roschini's 'primary' and 'secondary' principles do not hold good.

But let us try to follow his line of reasoning, as no doubt he represents the most enlightened Roman Catholic teaching on the subject.

The four 'secondary principles' which explain and justify the development of Mariology and the promulgation of the recent dogma, leave the door open for yet more developments in the future. Roschini himself states, with emphasis: 'Church Fathers and writers have almost exhausted the vocabulary to exalt her without ever being able to praise her as she deserves. Her greatness reaches the infinite.'

Let us state briefly these four 'principles' and as far as possible with Father Roschini's own words:

(a) The principle of *uniqueness*. The Most Holy Virgin being an entirely unique creature, in a separate order, she rightly claims entirely unique privileges, which cannot be granted to any other creature.

(b) The principle of *fitness*. One has to attribute to the Most Holy Virgin all those perfections which really befit her dignity as the Mother of God and man's mediatrix, as long as they have some foundations in revelation and are not contrary to faith and religion.

(c) The principle of *eminence*. All the privileges of nature, grace, and glory, which God has granted to the other Saints, he had to grant in some way also to the Most Holy Virgin Queen of Saints.

(d) The principle of *analogy or similarity with Christ*. To all the various privileges which were part of the humanity of Christ there are analogous privileges in the Most Holy Virgin, according to the conditions of the one and the other.

It is the principle of uniqueness to which the papal bull alludes with the words: 'God wanted to exclude the Blessed Virgin Mary' from the general law by which even the bodies of the just, after death, are decomposed, and only at the last day will they be reunited to their glorified soul. 'She,' says the bull,

'by an entirely singular privilege, has conquered sin by her Immaculate conception. Therefore she was not subject to the law compelling her to stay amidst the corruption of the sepulchre nor did she have to wait for the redemption of her body for the end of the world.'

The privilege of fitness is referred to when the bull speaks about 'the theological reasons which prove the supreme fitness for the corporal Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary to Heaven', and by a quotation from St John of Damascus.

The principle of eminence is hinted in the affirmation that 'the Apostolic See, heir of the office committed to the prince of the Apostles in order to confirm the faith of the brethren, with his authority has made this feast ever more solemn and has effectively urged the brethren to appreciate more and more the greatness of this mystery'. 'So', continues the bull, 'the feast of the Assumption from the place of honour which it held from earliest times among Marian celebrations, has now been raised to a most important and solemn position in the liturgical calendar.'

The principle of 'analogy or similarity with Christ' is everywhere in the bull. We have such phrases as these: 'August Mother of God mysteriously united to Jesus Christ from all eternity'; 'Generous partner of the Divine Redeemer, who brought about complete triumph over sin and its consequences'; 'Being preserved from the corruption of the grave and having conquered death, as did her Son, was lifted up body and soul to the glory of heaven.'

A DANGEROUS PATH

It was to be expected that a dogma which cannot claim for its support any clear biblical evidence, or the Apostolic Tradition, or the Tradition of the Church before the sixth century, and which has to turn to ingenious arguments about 'uniqueness', fitness', 'eminence', and 'analogy', should find among the most cultured and serious Roman Catholic thinkers considerable reserve on the subject and at times even opposition.

This attitude of reserve and opposition which has persisted especially in the West had not entirely disappeared when Pius the Twelfth sent to all Roman Catholic Bishops, on 1st May 1946, his, now well-known, secret letter: '*Deiparae Virginis*.' We know that some of the regular Bishops did not want to make a pronouncement on the subject, and that twenty-two expressed contrary opinions. Of the titular Bishops seventy-five did not answer and five expressed their doubts. From fourteen ecclesiastical universities two refused to sign the petition for the dogma, and from twenty-five Roman Catholic universities seven assumed an attitude of agnosticism. It is known that Ernest Hans (the eminent Patristic scholar of Munich), Gimán, Bartman, Fathers Dumont, D'Alès, Rivière, and the noted theologian Bertold Altaner, were definitely against a dogmatic definition of the Assumption.

Yet, in spite of all this opposition, the dogma has been proclaimed. Roman Catholic theologians, though claiming divine guidance in the Holy Spirit, can do without the Holy Scriptures and even without the testimony of the Early Fathers; it looks as if popular sentiments and infallible papal authority are sufficient for the purpose of defining dogmas. The Church of Rome is deliberately following a dangerous path. If dogma can be defined and solemnly

proclaimed without the slightest explicit or implicit Scriptural references, where will the 'development of dogma' lead? Judging from the dogmas already proclaimed concerning Mary it seems more than likely that newer and even more hyperbolic proclamations will be made. Is there a hint of the 'shape of things to come' in the papal bull? 'God, as a matter of fact, from all eternity, holds the Virgin Mary with very special care.' 'The Virgin Mary is presented by the Holy Fathers as the new Eve, closely united to the new Adam.' '... this solemn proclamation and definition of the Assumption will be of great advantage to all mankind, because it will give glory to the most Holy Trinity, to which the Virgin Mother of God is bound by unique ties.'

By this proclamation Pius the Twelfth has succeeded in erecting an even greater wall of division among Christians at a time when the world is desperately needing the witness of true co-operation and fellowship among all followers of Him, who long ago prayed 'that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me'.

GIACOMO A. LARDI

Editorial Comments (*continued from p. 200*)

Mayor, and McGeary. The Rev. Charles Atmore conducted the service and Mr Prichard preached the sermon.' Whatever may have been said by way of thanksgiving for so noble a life, the preacher could not have chosen a text more fitting: 'Neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I myself finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.'

.

Sometimes as I have preached from the old pulpit in Portland Chapel I have seemed to see old Thomas Webb standing erect, his scarlet tunic and gold epaulettes reminding me of Louisburg. On the open Bible lies his sword. Over his eye-socket is the green patch, but he is looking out of the West window to the land he loved so well. . . . How he would be welcomed at the eighth Ecumenical Methodist Conference at Oxford! He may be there. Who knows!

LESLIE F. CHURCH

WESLEY'S REVISION
OF THE COMMUNION SERVICE IN
*The Sunday Service of the Methodists*¹

ON 10TH SEPTEMBER 1784 John Wesley wrote a letter to 'Our Brethren in America' in which he said:

I have prepared a Liturgy little differing from that of the Church of England (I think, the best constituted National Church in the world), which I advise all the travelling preachers to use on the Lord's Day in all the congregations. . . . I also advise the elders to administer the Supper of the Lord on every Lord's Day.²

The Liturgy which Wesley had prepared was entitled, *The Sunday Service of the Methodists in North America, with other Occasional Services*.³ Further editions followed in subsequent years, variously entitled, *The Sunday Service of the Methodists in the United States of America*, *The Sunday Service of the Methodists in His Majesty's Dominions*, and *The Sunday Service of the Methodists*, in each case with the words *with other Occasional Services* added. An edition of 1788 with the last-named title, apparently issued for use in this country, has been used in these studies. The following preface, dated 9th September 1784, appeared in every edition except the first:

I believe there is no Liturgy in the world, either in ancient or modern language, which breathes more of a solid, scriptural, rational piety, than the Common Prayer of the Church of England. And though the main of it was compiled considerably more than two hundred years ago, yet is the language of it not only pure, but strong and elegant in the highest degree. Little alteration is made in the following edition of it, except in the following instances:

1. Most of the holy-days (so-called) are omitted as at present answering no valuable end.
2. The Service of the Lord's Day, the length of which has been often complained of, is considerably shortened.
3. Some sentences in the offices of Baptism, and for the burial of the dead are omitted; and,
4. Many psalms left out, and many parts of others, as being highly improper for the mouths of a Christian congregation.

¹ This article contains material from the author's book, *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in early Methodism*, to be published by the Dacre Press.

² *Letters of John Wesley* (Standard Edition), VII.239.

³ Much confusion has arisen both as regards the title of the first edition of *The Sunday Service* and the sequence of the titles of subsequent editions. The first edition of Richard Green's *Wesley Bibliography* is incomplete and inaccurate on these points, and the second edition should be consulted by those who wish to pursue this interesting study. *Wesley's Works*, XIV.303-4, has also led many unwary students astray. A facsimile of the title-page of the first edition of *The Sunday Service of the Methodists in North America*, which appeared in the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXVII.32, establishes the title beyond doubt. At least seven copies of this edition are known, all of them located in America. The Rev. Frank Baker, in a private communication, suggests that, as no one seems to have seen a 1784 edition entitled *United States of America*, Green has simply taken it on trust from Osborn, and that as Osborn had not seen a copy, he deduced the title wrongly from the undoubted edition of 1786.

Wesley's emendations were, however, much more extensive than this preface would suggest. For example, there is no hint in the preface that the Communion Office was revised, whereas actually it underwent considerable modification.

Confining this article to a consideration of the Communion Office, we shall first of all tabulate and classify the emendations in detail and then proceed to discuss the principles on which the revision, as a whole, was carried out.

I. TABULATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF EMENDATIONS

The following is a complete list of alterations which appeared in Wesley's Communion Service compared with that of the *Book of Common Prayer*.

<i>The Book of Common Prayer</i>	<i>Wesley's Revision</i>
1. Rubric relating to intending communicants giving names to the curate, and the repelling of evil-doers	Omitted
2. Rubric concerning the Table at Communion time:	
(a) 'shall stand in the body of the Church or in the chancel where morning or evening prayer are appointed to be said'	'shall stand in some convenient place'
(b) 'and the priest'	'and the elder'—and so throughout the service
(c) 'standing at the North side of the Table'	'standing at the Table'
3. Lord's Prayer and Collect for holiness	Unaltered
4. Rubric and Commandments	Unaltered
5. 'Then shall follow one of these two collects for the king, the Priest, standing as before, and saying . . .'	'Then shall follow this collect'
6. Collect, 'Almighty God, whose Kingdom . . .'	Omitted
7. Collect. 'Almighty and everlasting God . . .'	Unaltered
8. Rubrics for Collect, Epistle, and Gospel	Unaltered
9. 'And the gospel ended, shall be said or sung the creed following, the people still standing, as before . . .'	Creed omitted. 'Then shall follow the sermon'
10. Creed	Omitted

<i>The Book of Common Prayer</i>	<i>Wesley's Revision</i>	
11. Publication of Holy Days	Omitted	25.
12. Sermon	See above (item 9)	26.
13. 'Then shall the priest return to the Lord's Table, and begin the offertory saying one or more of these sentences following as he thinketh most convenient in his discretion'	'Then shall the elder say one or more of these sentences . . .'	27.
14. Sentences	Two deleted and one added	28.
15. Rubrics concerning offering:		
(a) 'the deacons, Church wardens or other fit person appointed'	'some fit person appointed'	
(b) 'provided by the parish'	Omitted	29.
(c) 'humbly present and place upon the holy table'	'shall place it upon the table'	30.
16. 'and when there is a communion, the priest shall then place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient'	Omitted	31.
17. Prayer for the whole estate:		
(a) Margin, 'be left out unsaid'	'be left unsaid'	
(b) 'unto his whole council'	Omitted	
(c) 'to all Bishops and curates'	'to all the ministers of Thy gospel'	
18. Three exhortations	Omitted	
19. 'Ye that do truly . . .'	Unaltered	32.
20. 'Then shall this general confession be made, in the name of all those that are minded to receive the holy communion by one of the ministers, both . . .'	'made by the Minister in the name of all that . . .'	
21. Confession	'the burden of them is intolerable' is omitted	33.
22. 'Then shall the priest (or the Bishop, being present) stand up, and turning himself to the people, pronounce this absolution'	'then shall the elder say . . .'	
23. Absolution:		34.
(a) 'who of his great mercy'	'of thy great mercy'	
(b) 'turn unto him'	'turn unto Thee'	
(c) 'have mercy upon you'	'have mercy upon us' and so 'us' for 'you' throughout the absolution	35.
24. 'Then shall the priest say'	'Then all standing, shall the elder say'	

<i>The Book of Common Prayer</i>	<i>Wesley's Revision</i>
25. Comfortable Words	Unaltered
26. Sursum Corda	Unaltered
27. 'Then shall the priest turn to the Lord's Table and say'	'Then shall the elder say'
28. Proper Prefaces:	
(a) Christmas Day—'of the substance of the Virgin Mary, His mother'	Omitted
(b) Trinity—'without any difference of inequality'	'difference or' omitted. In each case, 'and seven days after' is omitted. The punctuation is different in the Preface for Whitsunday
29. Rubric, 'be said or sung'	'be said'
30. Prayer of Humble Access	Add: 'the people also kneeling for the Prayer of Humble Access.' The Prayer itself is unaltered
31. Rubric before Prayer of Consecration: 'When the priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the bread and wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the prayer of Consecration, as followeth'	'Then shall the Elder say the Prayer of consecration, as followeth'
32. Prayer of Consecration:	
(a) 'by his one oblation of himself'	'by his oblation'
(b) Manual Acts: '(e) and here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it chalice or flagon) in which there is to be any wine to be consecrated'	'and here to lay his hand upon the cup'
33. The Communion:	
(a) 'To the Bishops, priests and deacons'	'to the other ministers'
(b) 'all meekly kneeling'	Omitted
34. Post-communion rubrics:	
(a) 'all spent'	'all used'
(b) 'and reverently place'	'and place'
35. The Lord's Prayer:	
(a) 'which art'	'who art'
(b) 'in earth'	'on earth'

<i>The Book of Common Prayer</i>	<i>Wesley's Revision</i>
36. The second post-communion prayer	Omitted
37. Rubric, 'then shall be said or sung'	'then shall be said'
38. Gloria	Unaltered
39. 'Then the priest (or Bishop, if he be present) shall let them depart with this blessing, "The Peace of God . . ."'	'Then the elder, if he see it expedient, may put up a prayer extempore; and afterward shall let the people depart with this blessing, "May the peace of God . . ."'
40. Collects to be said after the offertory when there is no communion	Omitted
41. Rubrics relating to number necessary to make a communion, disposal of elements, parishioners to communicate three times a year, on kneeling, and so on	All omitted

If a classification of these emendations be attempted, it will be seen that they fall into six categories.

(a) There are emendations which were necessitated by the fact that the book was to be used at Methodist services, and not in the Parish Church. Into this category we must place the following: the omission of rubrics relating to intending communicants giving their names to the curate, the situation of the Table in the chancel, the announcement of Holy Days, the bason to be 'provided by the parish'. The use of 'elder' for 'priest' and the omission of 'Bishops, priests, and deacons' also come into this category, but as they have a more important significance, they will be considered below.⁴

(b) Some alterations were made in the interests of brevity or of style. These include the omission of one of the two prayers for the King, of one of the two post-communion prayers, and of the three long exhortations. In the interests of style, words and phrases are altered or omitted—for example, 'be left unsaid' for 'be left out unsaid', 'who' for 'which' in the Lord's Prayer.

(c) Some ceremonial rubrics were omitted, such as those relating to the position of the minister at the Table, and his standing for the prayer of Consecration. If it was the custom in Wesley's day, as it is today, for the Poor Steward to prepare the Table before the service begins, the omission of the rubric about the preparation of the elements will also fall into this category. The omission of the rubric concerning kneeling to receive the elements may have been made in deference to the susceptibilities of Dissenters; on the other hand, as Methodists usually knelt to receive the elements, Wesley may have felt that such directions were unnecessary.

(d) Some alterations indicate the particular emphasis and the doctrinal position of Methodism. For example, throughout the service the term 'elder'

⁴ See paragraph (d).

is used instead of 'priest', an alteration which indicates the content which Wesley gave to the word πρεσβύτερος. It will be recalled that he ordained his preachers according to the three orders, 'deacons, elders, and superintendents'; though Henry Moore (and maybe others) was ordained 'presbyter'. In *The Sunday Service of the Methodists*, the ordination service is headed: 'The Form and Manner of Making and Ordaining of Superintendents, Elders, and Deacons.' Another alteration to notice in this category is that of the form of absolution. Instead of the priest referring to God in the third person and himself absolving the people whom he addresses in the second person, Wesley turns what is a pronouncement into a petition and makes the Elder, being one with the people and using the first person plural, pray with them to God for pardon. The Rev. T. H. Barratt quotes this as an indication that Wesley was no sacerdotalist, in line with the omission of the words, 'the remembrance of them (i.e. sins) is intolerable,' from the Confession. 'Those words', says Mr Barratt, 'would not fit the lips accustomed to sing, "My chains fell off, my heart was free"'.⁶ The Rev. Dr. J. E. Rattenbury, on the other hand, thinks it is difficult to say why Wesley made the change which, 'if subtle, was slow',⁶ but it may well be that the special conditions which prevailed in America accounted for the alteration. However that may be, Wesley himself certainly used the declaratory form of absolution and in *Popery Calmly Considered*, defended it:

We believe the absolution pronounced by the Priest is only declarative and conditional. For judicially to pardon sin and absolve the sinner, is a power God has reserved for himself.⁷

(e) The omission of the Nicene Creed stands in a class by itself. It is difficult to say why Wesley omitted the Creed and probably the reason will never be known. We can only surmise. It may have been done in the interests of brevity; it could hardly have been on the grounds of doctrine for there is nothing therein to which he is known to have dissented. He could have had no objection to the use of Creeds, as such, for the Apostles' Creed stands unaltered in his order of Morning and Evening Prayer. The most likely reason is that the Nicene Creed was omitted in the interests of brevity, especially as the Apostles' Creed was used elsewhere. The omission of 'of the substance of the Virgin Mary, His mother' from the Proper Preface for Christmas Day may reflect a dislike of the Roman worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It will be noticed that the words, 'and seven days after' are omitted from the rubrics relating to the recital of the Proper Prefaces on the Festivals. Although Wesley and his brother often kept Christmas and Easter for the eight days of 'the Octave', celebrating Holy Communion daily, the practice was not characteristic of Methodism generally.

(f) There are several additions which are significant. The people are instructed to stand for the Comfortable Words, where, in the *Book of Common Prayer*, there are no directions for the people. In making this addition, Wesley may have been influenced by the custom of standing for the reading of the Gospel, for the Comfortable Words are from, or in keeping with, the Gospels and as they convey the invitation to the Lord's Table, they unmistakably bear

⁶ *London Quarterly Review*, July, 1923.

⁶ *The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley*, p. 91.

⁷ *Wesley's Works*, X.53.

the spirit of the Gospels. Another addition is the rubric that ministers and people are to kneel for the Prayer of Humble Access. In the *Book of Common Prayer*, the priest only is instructed to kneel. Finally, the permission to use extempore prayer after Communion is one of the most significant additions which Wesley made when revising the Communion Service for it is the expression of a marked feature of the early Methodist celebrations of the Lord's Supper. The recital of the words, '*Therefore with Angels and Archangels . . .*' by the minister and people is a feature of Methodist Communion Services which is still observed today, but is not reflected in Wesley's revision, for he follows the *Book of Common Prayer*, which directs that these words be said by the minister only. It is not unlikely, however, that as early as Wesley's day, the people also joined in the recital of these words. I have been told that this custom is still to be found in a few Anglican Churches with an evangelical tradition. Directions for the people to join are found in a copy of *The Sunday Service* dated 1865, and omitted in an edition of 1878. They are included in the revised Order of 1882 and in the latest edition of 1936. It ought to be noted that the rubric directing that people stand for the Gospel, the rubrics concerning the Manual Acts* and the directions for second and subsequent consecrations are all preserved by Wesley but deleted from nineteenth-century service books.

II. PRINCIPLES

Is it possible to discern any underlying principles which guided Wesley as he revised his *Prayer Book*? He was, in any case, adept at abridgement for he read scarcely anything of importance without reissuing it in an abridged form for the benefit of his people. Is the revision of the *Prayer Book* merely another example of his 'editing'?

An illuminating reference is found in a letter, dated 20th June 1789, to Walter Churchey. Wesley says:

Dr Coke made two or three little alterations in the Prayer Book without my knowledge. I took particular care throughout to alter nothing merely for altering's sake. In religion, I am for as few innovations as possible. I love the old wine best. And if it were only on this account, I prefer "which" before 'who art in heaven'.

In revising the *Prayer Book* he seems to have been governed by both practical and doctrinal motives. He had to deal with the need for the administration of the Sacraments to his people outside the Parish Churches; he had to equip with a suitable Order of Service his preachers in America (and later, in Scotland and England also). Probably it was this practical situation which first drove him to attempt a revision of the Liturgy; but when he was driven to do it, he was compelled to make alterations of a doctrinal and, incidentally, of a literary nature.

In the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* for June 1942 the Rev. Frederick Hunter, M.A., claims that Wesley's revision of the *Prayer Book* (considering the book as a whole) 'was chiefly inspired by suggestions which were made by

* For the Manual Acts in the Methodist Communion Office, see article by the present writer in the LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW, October 1945.

* *Letters*, VIII.145; at the same time, he altered 'which' to 'who' in the Lord's Prayer in the Communion Service.

the Presbyterians at the Savoy Conference in 1661', and as his authority for the Presbyterian suggestions Mr. Hunter uses Edmund Calamy's *Abridgement of Mr. Baxter's History of his Life and Times*. It so happens, however, that the Communion Office shows the Presbyterian influence *less* than any other service in the book. Mr. Hunter admits this and mentions the following points of revision.

(a) The Manual Acts, insisted upon at the Savoy Conference, were included in the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1662 and Wesley retained them. As it appears certain that he was never likely to omit them, it is also certain, as Hunter observes, that he was here only indirectly, if at all, indebted to the suggestions of the Savoy Conference.

(b) The Presbyterians objected to the rubric which enjoined kneeling to receive the elements. Wesley omitted this rubric not so much under the influence of the Savoy Conference as in deference to the Dissenters who were attending Methodist Communion Services.

(c) With the Presbyterians, Wesley omits the rubric which enjoins parishioners to take Communion three times a year. Hunter again admits, 'in this he was hardly under Presbyterian influence'. As we have observed, Wesley omitted this for the obvious reason that his book was for Methodists on their own premises and not for use at the Parish Church. We could hardly expect the author of the sermon 'On the Duty of Constant Communion' to countenance a suggestion that three times a year was sufficient!

In a later issue of the *Proceedings*, Dr. J. E. Rattenbury comments upon Mr. Hunter's claims, but deals mainly with the factors which prompted Wesley to issue the revision for America. Dr. Rattenbury would attach less influence to the Presbyterians and more to the practical exigencies of the situation in America, adding, as a further factor: 'Wesley's passion for abridgement.' Dr. Rattenbury is no doubt right in emphasizing the practical situation in America, but, recalling the letter to Walter Churchey, we cannot seriously account for what he did simply by ascribing it to his passion for abridgement. It is true that Wesley used the blue pencil freely, but not without principles. A truer judgement would be that practical motives were primary, and that much that was doctrinal was bound up with them.

It is difficult to think that Wesley would have issued his own version of the Liturgy for which, on his own confession, he had so high a regard, had not circumstances in America forced the task upon him. These circumstances were not wholly unconnected with belief—especially when it is remembered the large number of Puritans which made up the New World and the Methodist Church therein. Indeed, in view of the fact that they hated a Prayer Book in any form—and especially the book of 1662—it is to be wondered that Wesley insisted upon the use of a Liturgy at all.

This revision of the *Book of Common Prayer* is a significant act of Wesley. The fact that he made and insisted upon the use of a revision¹⁰ shows him a Churchman; the manner of the revision on the whole, shows him an evangelical.

JOHN C. BOWMER

¹⁰ A Dissenter in Wesley's time would have destroyed the *Prayer Book*, not revised it.—Dr. Rattenbury, *The Conversion of the Wesleys*, p. 216.

THE CHRISTIAN FUTURE¹

WHAT DOES the future hold in store for Christianity? Is Jesus to be a waning force in the life of mankind? Other religions and the influence of their founders have arisen, flourished, and become stagnant. In many instances they have disappeared. If Christianity and Jesus are exceptions they are unique in the history of mankind. Yet if, as Christians declare, Jesus is unique, if he is the eternal Word, the *only* son of the everlasting God, we would expect Christianity to be the exception. But is Christianity not only to go on: is it ultimately to prevail? Will it win all men? Will all acknowledge Jesus as Lord and Saviour? Will all be conformed fully to the standards which Jesus declared to be the will of God, the ideal to which God wishes all men to attain? If Christianity prevails, what will happen to the various rival religions, philosophies, and ideologies, which command the allegiance of men? Will they disappear completely? Or will Christianity, modified by them, be a synthesis of them all, holding Jesus as central but displaying evidence of the earlier existence of its rivals? Will the victorious Christianity be a composite of what has gone before, preserving whatever insights into truth have come from the systems which it has superseded?

To answer these questions is to prophesy, and human prophecy is notoriously fallible. 'Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail,' we are told. History is strewn with the record of forecasts which have been disproved by the event. Yet not all attempts to outline the main trends of the future have been mistaken. Some have been verified. The future usually grows out of the past and the present. Often it is possible so to discern the course which events have taken and are taking as to know the shape of things to come. Even major significant movements may occur, quite unpredicted and unpredictable. Details escape us. Yet the future need not be entirely hid from our eyes. So can it be with much of the future of Christianity and of the human race as shaped by Jesus.

The New Testament and the logic of the Christian faith predict the final triumph of Christ. We are told that it is the purpose of God as a plan for the fullness of time to sum up and unite all things in Christ, things in heaven and things on earth (Ephesians 1⁹⁻¹⁰). Since Christ is the incarnate Word, the Word become flesh and dwelling among us, since through the Word all things were made and without the Word was nothing made that has been made, it must be that eventually Christ will triumph. All our knowledge, both from the Bible and from what has been discerned through human reason, leads us to believe that the universe is the universe—that it is a unity, that through all of it, even the most remote stars, runs what we call 'natural law'. So far as our scientific instruments enable us to peer into the most distant spaces, the chemical elements are the same throughout and, given the same conditions, behave in precisely the same manner. To be sure, the moral sphere displays disorder. In the universe there is a tough, resistant element which makes for chaos and suffering. In human beings it becomes sin. But order is normal and disorder abnormal. 'The whole creation groans in travail together until now,' but it is the Christian faith that 'the creation was subjected to futility, not of his own

¹ This article is from *The Coming-of-Age of Christianity*, edited by Sir James Marchant (Latimer House, 12s. 6d.).

will but by the will of him who subjected it in hope: because the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God' (Romans 8²⁰⁻²). How disorder came to be we do not know, but since the universe is a unity, since God created it and created it through the Word which is God and which became incarnate in Christ, and since the unity of the universe is from God, and God is sovereign, ultimately Christ must prevail over the disorder 'that God may be all in all'.

But will this victory of Christ over man's disorder—over human frailty and sin—be accomplished within history? Will it be achieved while man is in this flesh and upon this planet? Or will it wait for what is beyond history? Will it be accomplished only on the other side of the grave, beyond physical death, the physical death of the individual and of the race? The Christian faith declares that Christ has triumphed over death, that for those who believe in Him physical death is simply an incident in eternal life, that, indeed, those who have given themselves completely to Christ will not even notice physical death, so fully will the life that is in them through Christ have prevailed. Physical death will be a release to a further stage of that love for God and for one's neighbour which is of the essence of eternal life. Will progress toward this ideal of conformity to the love of God ever proceed so far within history that man will attain to his full stature in Christ on this planet?

On first sight the answer seems to be in the affirmative. The Christian is taught by his Lord to pray: 'Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.' The apostles were commanded to make disciples of all nations, baptizing them—teaching them to observe all that our Lord had commanded them. This involves, of course, teaching all men to attain to the high standards set forth in the Sermon on the Mount, including the ideal: 'Be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect.' God would not command the impossible. He who is love, who so loved the world that He gave His only son, would not set before men as an obligation an end which is unattainable.

Yet on second thought it is clear that this goal is not to be reached within history. The life of individuals on this planet is too short to become perfect as God is perfect, to be filled unto all the fullness of God. Not even the greatest Christians have done so within the brief compass of the sixty, seventy, or eighty years to which their course on the earth is confined. St Paul himself freely acknowledged that he had not already obtained this or was already perfect. He pressed on toward the goal of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus, straining forward to make it his own, because Christ Jesus had made him His own (Philippians 3¹²⁻¹⁴). If this is true of individuals, even the greatest of the saints, it must certainly be true of the vast body of Christians, the Church, made up of those 'who profess and call themselves Christians', and still more of the rank and file of mankind.

This, indeed, is clearly stated in the New Testament. Christians 'wait for a new heaven and a new earth in which righteousness dwells' (2 Peter 3¹³), but this will come after the earth and the heavens as we have known them shall have passed. In one of the striking parables of Jesus the weeds and the wheat are described as growing together until the harvest (Matthew 13³⁰). During history both evil and good are to continue to mount.

Eventually the course of mankind on this planet will come to an end. This

may be by some cosmic catastrophe, such as contact of our solar system with another star, perhaps in some such fashion as may have given birth to the planets, including our earth. It may be by the slow loss of air and water. It may be by the recurrence of an ice age more extensive and more frigid than the globe has yet known. Man may destroy himself through the misuse of atomic energy. In one of these ways or in some other way history will cease. The nature of the Christian ideal is such that it cannot be fully attained on this planet by beings whose individual lives here are limited to a few decades. Thus far in history the parable of the weeds and the wheat is being fulfilled. Both evil and good are growing. For instance, war becomes progressively more of a threat to mankind as a whole, more colossal in its dimensions. Yet the efforts to curb war and to rid mankind of war also increase. The forecast in the New Testament is borne out by the facts.

Does this mean that progress toward the Christian goal is not to be seen within history? Must mankind wait until history is over to experience the triumph of Christ? Does each individual and each generation start from the beginning?

Here the answer is an emphatic negative. Progress is occurring. Jesus has been and is a mounting force in the life of mankind. In spite of appearances to the contrary, never has He been as influential as He has in the present century. Unless a long-term trend, a trend now more than nineteen centuries long, is reversed, that influence will continue to grow.

If one views mankind as a whole, as one must to gain accurate perspective, the effect of Jesus upon the human race is perceived to have gone forward by great pulsations. At times it has waned, but after each decline it has moved on to fresh advances. The periods of its waning have paralleled the death of cultures with which Christianity and, accordingly, the influence of Jesus have been intimately associated. They have grown out of the very success of Christianity. That faith has been so vital that it has won the allegiance of the overwhelming majority of a particular centre of culture. That culture, as is the lot of all cultures, has disintegrated. Christianity has proved unable to save it. Indeed, it is not the function of Christianity to save any culture. There is that about Jesus which disturbs all individuals and cultures where He makes Himself felt. He himself declared that He came not to bring peace but a sword. He and His teachings are so far beyond the practice of any group or society that they are revolutionary. To identify Him or them with any culture is to do Him and them violence. But again and again Christianity has become so closely intertwined with a culture as to seem to be identified with it. When, accordingly, that culture was disintegrated, Christianity has for a time declined as a boon in the human scene. Always, however, the decay of that culture has proved a boon. It has released Christianity from a connexion which has compromised Jesus and has restricted the full expression of the inner genius of the Christian faith. Released from that embarrassing alliance, the life inherent in Jesus has broken out afresh and, after a time, has made a wider and deeper impression on the human race than before.

At least four of these pulsations, these advances followed by recessions and again succeeded by advances, have been seen in the nineteen and a half centuries since the birth of Jesus. The first was associated with the Roman

Empire and with Graeco-Roman civilization. Jesus, it will be recalled, was born during the reign of Augustus Caesar, the first Roman Emperor. In other words, Christianity began almost contemporaneously with the Roman Empire. Both arose out of antecedent movements but came into being not far from the same time. Within five centuries Christianity had won the professed allegiance of the Roman Empire. The Emperors were then Christians and the Church had the support of the State. This was a major achievement. At the outset Christianity was only one of many faiths competing for the adherence of the peoples of the Mediterranean world. Several of its rivals appeared to have far better prospects. Yet Christianity had supplanted them all except Judaism. By A.D. 500, to be a Roman was almost synonymous with being a Christian and to be a Christian was usually to be a Roman citizen. Herein lay a great peril for Christianity. The Roman Empire was by no means the only civilized centre of mankind. Immediately to the east lay Persia, and beyond Persia were India and China, all three of them, especially the last two, civilized lands. At the time when the Roman Empire had reached its height, China, then under the Han Dynasty, was about the same dimensions in square miles and possibly not far from the same size of population as the former. While not united politically, India was highly civilized. Christianity had spread through the Roman Empire, but it had by no means won all of civilized mankind and had only barely touched the great masses of primitive man which spread over most of the land surface of the globe. When Christianity had begun its expansion, Graeco-Roman civilization was already ill. Christianity did not cure that illness. By A.D. 500 Christianity was all but identified with a culture which was obviously dying. With the passing of that culture Christianity would suffer seriously and itself might also perish. The influence of Jesus might soon be only a fading memory.

For centuries after A.D. 500 the prospect of Christianity appeared sombre. Christianity was clearly losing ground. Wave after wave of barbarians swept from the north into the Mediterranean Basin. While the first invaders were partly Christian, the later ones were frankly pagan and often singled out churches and monasteries for looting. Even more serious was the Arab conquest from the south-west. This brought with it a new religion, Islam. While honouring Jesus, it claimed to have a later revelation which denied the incarnation, the crucifixion, and the resurrection, the very core of the Christian faith, and exalted Mohammed. Islam tore from Christendom about half the latter's territory, by far the most serious loss which Christianity has ever suffered. By the tenth century Christianity, while still in existence, appeared to be passing.

Then came a great forward movement. Because of the vitality inherent in Christianity through its central figure, Jesus Christ, the faith was seen to have profited by the decline of the Roman Empire. So long as the Roman State was strong it tended to dominate the Church and so to restrict the free operation of the spirit of Jesus. This, indeed, was still the situation in the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, where Rome, in the form of the Byzantine Empire, continued. However, on the north-western shores of the Mediterranean—in south-western Europe, where the Empire had all but disappeared—the Church came forward to protect the weak and to maintain order. In Europe the Christian faith won the barbarians and began the slow task of teaching them its ideals

and of disciplining them in the Christian life. It spread beyond the former borders of the Roman Empire and won all of the British Isles, Germany, Scandinavia, and the Slavs. In spite of being handicapped by its domination by the State, from the Byzantine realms it spread northward among the Bulgars and into Russia. Although represented by a persecuted or barely tolerated minority in the Tigris-Euphrates Valley, Christianity expanded eastward across Central Asia into China and was present in India. East of the Byzantine realms, except in Armenia, Christians never constituted majorities. Yet by A.D. 1350 Christianity was more widely distributed geographically than it or any other religion had ever been. Christians were to be found from Greenland in the north and west to the Sudan in the south and to the China Sea in the east.

Moreover, in western Europe, Christianity had become powerful in helping to create a new culture, that of Medieval Europe. This culture was by no means fully Christian. No civilization has ever really deserved the name of Christian. Yet upon the Europe of the Middle Ages, Jesus made a deeper impression than He had upon the Roman Empire. The Church was the vehicle by which most of what was present in Medieval Europe from Rome and Greece had been transmitted. Impulses coming from the Christian faith gave rise to most of the schools and universities, shaped the business ideals, exerted something of a control over the chronic fighting and the professional warriors, set standards for conduct, inspired sculpture, literature, painting, music, and architecture, made themselves felt in law and government, and stimulated care for the sick, the widows, the orphans, and travellers. The intellectual basis for modern scientific achievements was largely the creation of the Christian faith. From that source came the confidence in an orderly universe which is at the foundation of science. From it, too, came the tradition of disciplined, logical thought, for in seeking to give intellectual formulation to Christian truth, in other words, through theological thought and debate, the western European mind was prepared for achievements in secular aspects of scholarship.

Then came another great period of transition. Vast political changes in Asia brought death to most of the widely scattered minority groups of Christians. In western Europe the culture of the Middle Ages passed: the Renaissance and the commercial revolution ushered in a new Europe. The disappearance of Medieval culture threatened Christianity, for the two had been intimately associated. The Renaissance, while in part growing out of Christianity and usually rendering lip service to it, tended toward a quite secular humanism. Nation States were being consolidated under absolute monarchs and these monarchs sought to control the Church in their respective domains and to make it subservient to their wills. Western Europeans began wide-reaching geographic discoveries and conquests and the first wave of these bore with extreme harshness on the native populations in practical disregard of all Christian standards. The Church was corrupt from its head, the Papacy and the Papal Court, down to the monasteries and the local clergy. To this there were notable exceptions, but they were exceptions.

At the time when the situation of Christianity seemed most desperate, a remarkable revival occurred. This came mainly in the sixteenth century and took the forms of the Protestant Reformation and the Catholic Reformation.

In Protestantism the life inherent in the Christian faith proved so vital that it could not be contained in the traditional Roman Catholic Church but had expressions which departed more or less radically from the Catholic tradition. In the Catholic Reformation the fresh life was retained within the inherited Church, but cleansed the latter from many of its worst moral abuses. Under the impulse of the revival, missionaries accompanied the explorers and conquerors or even went ahead of them. Since the chief colonizing powers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were Spain and Portugal, Roman Catholic countries, most of the missionaries were Roman Catholics. They planted the faith in the Americas, here and there along the coast of Africa, and in India, south-eastern Asia, the East Indies, the Philippines, China, and Japan. Protestants also had missions, in North America, India, and the East Indies, but much less extensive than those of Roman Catholics. By the middle of the eighteenth century Christianity, and with it the influence of Jesus Christ, was more widely extended than ever before. Moreover, it was having a profound effect upon the new Europe—in giving birth to international law, in stimulating the development of democracy, in new forms of education for the rank and file of the population, and in literature, music, and art. On the frontiers of European settlement, conscience, quickened and given fortitude by Jesus Christ, was fighting the exploitation of the native populations and was writing into the statute books humane laws for the protection of the non-European subjects of Europeans.

The eighteenth century introduced another major crisis for Christianity and the influence of Jesus upon mankind. Western Europe and its colonies moved into a series of revolutions. The spark which set them off was the American Revolution through which the Thirteen Colonies left the British Empire and became the United States. The French Revolution followed with consequent upheavals in other countries in Europe. The Spanish-American colonies broke away from their mother country. The revolutions were more than political. They entailed revolt from the established order, and of that established order the Church was an integral part. A series of wars also swept across Christendom, the most severe of them associated with the French Revolution, and a child of that Revolution, Napoleon. Intellectually, Europe seemed to be moving away from Christianity. The era was that of the Enlightenment and of Rationalism. The eighteenth century led naturally into the nineteenth century and the age of science. The scientific approach seemed to many to mean the end of Christianity. Through its doctrine of evolution it appeared to have disproved the story of creation and of the fall of man. The Industrial Revolution and the attendant growth of manufacturing and commercial cities with the vast shifts in population moved millions away from their accustomed associations with the Church. Many freely predicted that Christianity would disappear and that such remnants of the faith as survived would live on only through the inertia which sociologists dub 'social lag', the fashion in which remnants of a bygone age persist after the mass of mankind has moved beyond them.

Again the vitality inherent in Christianity broke out afresh and made the nineteenth century the greatest period up to that time of the influence of Jesus Christ upon mankind. The awakening began first and was most marked in Protestantism. Its foreshadowings were in the Pietist and Moravian movements

in Germany. It became prominent in the Great Awakening in the Thirteen Colonies and the Evangelical Movement in the British Isles. It swelled to a flood in the nineteenth century, particularly in Britain and the United States. The Protestant churches grew in numbers and vigour and great humanitarian reforms followed for the benefit of mankind—the abolition of Negro slavery, prison reform, the nursing profession, better conditions for labourers in factories and mines, and a score or more of others. In the Roman Catholic Church new orders arose, more than in any one preceding century, and the control of the Papacy over the Church became more absolute. Under the Papacy the Roman Catholic Church became more closely knit as it faced a hostile world and endeavoured to propagate the faith. Christianity was spread more widely geographically than before and became more than ever the most extensive of the religions of mankind. The effect of Jesus upon mankind as a whole mounted to unprecedented dimensions. It was still far from dominant, but it was more widely potent than in any earlier century. The expansion of Christianity was through vast migrations of professedly Christian peoples to the Americas, Australasia, and Africa. It was also through missions. In this spread, Protestants were relatively more active than Roman Catholics, but both wings of Christianity displayed phenomenal growth.

Again, in the present century, mankind is in the midst of a great transition. More than in any previous era in the long history of the race, the foundations of all civilizations are shaken. Every major people and most minor tribes and peoples are in the midst of a vast revolution. There have been other ages when the changes in an individual culture were as marked as they are today. Never before at any one time have the overwhelming majority of mankind been in the midst of as profound transformation as in the present century.

The forces which have brought about this revolution had their origin in what we are accustomed to call Christendom, the region and peoples upon whom Christianity has been longest exerting its influence. Within the Occident—Christendom—they are shattering the existing culture so extensively that again one age is passing and another is being born. Among non-Occidental peoples, a double revolution is in progress: one, in itself profound, is produced by the impact of the Occident, and the other comes from the fact that the culture whose impact is causing the revolution is itself in process of rapid disintegration.

In this time of change, Christianity is again threatened. Once more a culture with which it has been closely associated is passing, and there are those who believe it to be sharing the fate of its companion. Here and there Christianity has suffered losses in numbers, particularly in France, Germany, and Russia, but also, although less spectacularly, in the British Isles.

Yet, if the entire world is surveyed, Christianity has made striking gains. If a single year is to be singled out as the beginning of the present era, it must be 1914, that of the opening of the first of the world wars which have racked the world in our generation. In the decades which have followed the outbreak of World War I, Christianity has advanced in at least four ways.

(To be continued)

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE

BUNYAN AS A MAN OF LETTERS

Bunyan was not a mere religious enthusiast; he was, however unconsciously, an artist as well. In *Pilgrim's Progress* we taste the old rural life with its songs and country mirth, and we hear the sound of the English language already come to perfection and not yet defiled. . . . The language of *Pilgrim's Progress* has two sources—first the Bible, and, secondly and no less, the pure, crisp, telling English then spoken by the common people. From that common source, indeed, the English translators of the Bible had drawn their power of words, also irrecoverable in our day when a thousand distracting influences have marred common speech and writing in every class of society.

—G. M. Trevelyan

IT HAS been said that Bunyan was the last author who wrote without thought of the reviewer. Perhaps that is one of the chief secrets of his universal popularity. For to this attitude of independence, to the fearlessness and confidence with which, in spite of his poor education, he entered upon his great task, is due much of the charm which brings the greatest of his works most closely home to 'men's bosomes and businesse'. Bunyan himself had misgivings about his style of writing; he feared that his gentle reader might blame him because he had not 'beautified his matter with acuteness of language' and had not 'either in the line or the margin given a cloud of sentences from the Holy Fathers'. He little thought that, long after his learned contemporaries were dead and forgotten, he would be remembered and loved. And yet it was because he wrote uninfluenced by the fashion of the age and refused to conform to its highflown conceits, that he attained the unconscious ease and naturalness of expression, the wealth of imagery, and the apt and pungent phraseology, which have made his writings attractive alike to young and old, learned and unlearned.

These qualities alone would not have ensured his immortality. But added to them he had a keen sense of humour, a vivid descriptive faculty, and an eye for detail of which Chaucer need not have been ashamed. In the words of his first biographer: 'He had a sharp, quick eye, accompanied with an excellent discerning of persons, being of good judgement and quick wit.' He was no stylist, in the ordinary sense of the word; but he had a very original way of writing—homely, unpretentious, infused with biblical phraseology, which however he had so assimilated that it never gives the impression of incongruity or affectation. Further, he was no bigot and no fanatic; all his writings are characterized by a breadth of religious sympathy entirely free from the trammels of sectarianism.

Like his contemporary Defoe, he owed most of his reputation as a man of letters to a single work of genius. Indeed, although he wrote more than sixty books altogether, only five or six of them show any outstanding merit. Many of his theological works are little above the average tract of his time; but it was a little allegory hidden away in the three enormous volumes of his collected works which made his fame. Whitman's distinction between 'loving by allowance' and 'loving with personal love' applies to books as well as to men. Ever since it was published *Pilgrim's Progress* has been loved with a personal love. At first, indeed, its influence was more or less limited to the middle classes, but it has steadily increased in popularity until today it is found in almost every English home, and forms, with the works of Shakespeare, one of the links which

bind together the English-speaking races on either side of the Atlantic. 'This is the great merit of the book,' says Dr Johnson, 'that the most cultivated man cannot find anything to praise more highly, and the child knows nothing more amusing.'

Criticism is becoming an art of saying fine things: but about Bunyan there are no fine things to be said—paradox and epigram seem out of place in describing his unassuming and straightforward writings. He was entirely free from the classical tradition; he did not, like De Quincey, try to charm his readers by an eloquent flow of Ciceronian periods, or, like Gibbon, to enthral their imaginations by his vivid word-painting. Rather should he be compared to St Paul, whose 'speech and preaching was not with enticing words of men's wisdom, but in demonstration of the spirit and in power'. In his autobiography, *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners*, he writes: 'I was brought up in my father's home in a very mean condition among a company of poor country men.'

Bunyan's early life seems to have been very uneventful. He was educated at a free school and afterwards worked at his father's trade. In his seventeenth year he was drafted as a soldier in the Civil War and served for two years in the Parliamentary army at Newport Pagnell. When only nineteen he married a pious young woman whose dowry seems to have consisted solely in two books, the *Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven*, and the *Practice of Piety*. With his usual *naïveté* he tells us how he and his wife were 'as poor as poor might be', without so much household stuff as a dish or a spoon between them. About this time he met a man who 'did talk pleasantly of Scripture', and, to quote his own words: 'I betook me to my Bible and began to take great pleasure in reading; but especially with the historical part thereof. For as for Paul's epistles and such like Scriptures I could not away with them.' In 1653 Bunyan joined the Baptist Church and began to preach, and in 1660 he was committed to Bedford Jail, at first for three months, but on his refusing to desist from preaching, his confinement was extended to a period of nearly twelve years. The majority of his works were written during these years of imprisonment. Previously he had been brought into collision with the followers of George Fox (the founder of the Society of Friends), who were then a very aggressive body. As a result of this Bunyan published in 1656 a theological treatise called *Some Gospel Truths Opened*, to which Edward Burroughs, an eminent Quaker, replied. Very shortly after, Bunyan made rejoinder with another large volume, *A Vindication of Gospel Truths Opened*. These earliest efforts of his pen are characterized by an ease of style and a directness and naturalness altogether remarkable as compositions of a working man whose schooldays were a far-off memory. The age of the Revolution was pre-eminently the age of the pamphleteer, and Bunyan himself was more concerned with the urgent needs of the moment than with aiming, like Thucydides, at the production of a $\kappa\rho\eta\mu\alpha\ \epsilon\varsigma\ \delta\iota\alpha\iota$.

Few, if any, autobiographies are perfectly unbiased; some men take delight in exaggerating their faults, others in glossing them over. 'Such as I was,' said Rousseau, 'I have declared myself: sometimes vile and despicable, at others, virtuous, generous, and sublime.' But even his famous *Confessions* are in many places tissues of picturesque fiction and self-deception. In *De Profundis* Wilde claimed to have laid bare his soul to the world, but that remarkable book is now generally recognized to have been but another of its author's

innumerable poses. Bunyan's *Grace Abounding* is no exception to the rule. In that intense record he represents himself as having lived a most abandoned life in his youth. Like R. L. Stevenson he was haunted by awful nightmares—'those terrible dreams did have me which also I soon forgot, for my pleasures did quickly cut off the remembrance of them as if they had never been; so that until I came to the state of marriage I was the very ringleader of the youth that kept me company in all manner of vice and ungodliness.' So Bunyan enlarges upon his faults and lays bare his fears that he had committed the 'unpardonable sin', writing with perfect sincerity of all his doubts and perplexities. 'I was tossed between the devil and my own ignorance, and so perplexed, especially at times, that I could not tell what to do.'

Most important among the books which Bunyan wrote during his first imprisonment were the versified *Profitable Meditations*; a treatise called *Praying in the Spirit*, written in a very exalted strain, but marred by a bigoted diatribe against the *Book of Common Prayer*; *The Holy City*, a picturesque exposition of the closing chapters of the Book of Revelation, which is interesting 'as being a kind of foregleam of that Celestial City to which in after days he conducted the pilgrims of his dream'; and *A Confession of my Faith and a Reason of my Practice*. None of these books have greatly affected Bunyan's literary reputation. Perhaps the last named is the most interesting among them. It is a kind of 'apologia pro vita sua', standing by his convictions 'while so weighty an argument as eleven years' imprisonment was continually urging him to pause and consider again the grounds and foundation of those principles for which he had suffered'.

After the Declaration of Indulgence of 1672 Bunyan was released from prison and became a licensed preacher. But three years later the Declaration was cancelled, and the licences of Nonconformist preachers were recalled by proclamation. A warrant was issued for Bunyan's arrest, he was brought to trial under the Conventicle Act, and was again sent to prison for six months. It was during this second imprisonment that he wrote the allegory on which rests most of his fame as a man of letters. A book might easily be filled with tributes to the genius of *Pilgrim's Progress*. Boswell records Dr Johnson's remark that it had great merits 'both for invention, imagination, and the conduct of the story', and also the following characteristic words spoken to Mrs Thrale: 'Alas, Madam! How few books are there of which one can possibly arrive at the last page! Was there ever yet anything written by mere man that was wished longer by its readers, excepting *Don Quixote*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and the *Pilgrim's Progress*?' Swift declared: 'I have been better entertained and more informed by a few pages in the *Pilgrim's Progress* than by a long discourse on the will and the intellect and simple or complex ideas.'

Pilgrim's Progress is a story in allegorical form of a human soul seeking salvation and battling against all the obstacles and difficulties and temptations which obstruct its way. It is written in pure Saxon-English with delightful humour and pathos and a wonderful richness of imaginative power. It is full of imagery, but never obscure; its characters are not vague, shadowy creatures from a mystical world, but real men of flesh and blood. The first half of the book, which is pure allegory, gives an inimitable picture of social life in the lower middle class of England; the second half, which was not published till 1684,

and in which are woven long and intricate theological discourses, affords a very vivid glimpse into a Puritan household.

Two of the most striking characteristics of *Pilgrim's Progress* are the raciness of its narrative and the graphic reality of its portraiture. Bunyan realized that by paying attention to minute detail of description he could impart to the most improbable situations a vivid and life-like reality. As in the beginning of the *Odyssey*, the opening scene of *Hamlet*, and the first page of the *Divina Commedia*, the reader's attention is gripped at the outset; and without any artifice of style or gorgeous word-painting, without attempting to bewilder or to enthrall or to impress, but by simple homely description and by 'laying down the thing as it is', Bunyan rivets the attention and transports his reader to the wonderful regions of his imagination:

As I walked through the wilderness of this world, I lighted upon a certain place where was a den, and laid me down in that place to sleep; and as I slept I dreamed a dream. I dreamed and behold, I saw a man clothed with rags, standing in a certain place, with his face from his house, a book in his hand, and a great burden upon his back. I looked and saw him open the book and read therein; and, as he read, he wept and trembled, and, not being able longer to contain, he brake out with a lamentable cry, saying: 'What shall I do?'

Let us compare with this De Quincey's description of one of his dreams:

Then came sudden alarms, hurrys to and fro; trepidations of innumerable fugitives, I knew not whether from the good cause or the bad; darkness and lights; tempest and human faces; and at last, with the sense that all was lost, female forms and the features that were worth all the world to me; and but a moment allowed, and clasped hands with heart-breaking partings, and then everlasting farewells! and with a sigh such as the earth sighed when the incestuous mother uttered the abhorred name of Death, the sound was reverberated—everlasting farewells! and again and yet again reverberated—everlasting farewells!

Both passages are intensely vivid, but the means by which the vividness and realism are attained are diametrically opposed to each other. Bunyan is plain, simple, straightforward. He uses, as a rule, short sentences and always the most homely words. 'There is not', said Macaulay, 'in *Pilgrim's Progress* a single expression, if we except a few technical terms of theology, that would puzzle the rudest peasant.' De Quincey, on the other hand, relies for his effect on balanced harmonies of language, on gorgeous and fantastic word-painting, on an almost oriental richness and warmth of colouring.

There is no need to trace the various stages of Christian's pilgrimage to the Celestial City, the Slough of Despond, the Wicket Gate, the Wayside Cross, the Hill Difficulty, the Palace Beautiful, the Valley of the Shadow of Death, and at last the land of Beulah. They are all interwoven with the earliest recollections of our childhood. But, as we have already observed, Bunyan's place as well as his characters are drawn from actual experience, and, unlike the illimitable regions to which Milton transports his readers, they are the common places of the earth, and not vast regions of the imagination.

But the most delightful feature of *Pilgrim's Progress* is undoubtedly its character-drawing. There is scarcely any type of human being, from the highest to

the lowest, and the most noble to the most mean, who is not here portrayed. In fact, to Bunyan might well be applied the phrase of Quintillian, *totam vitae imaginem expressit*. For every class, every rank, every type of mind, every outlook on life is represented in the book. Spenser had treated a theme similar to that of Bunyan's masterpiece, and treated it allegorically, but what a difference there is between the lifeless, humourless puppets of *The Faerie Queene* and the intensely real and human characters among whom Christian moves: between Una and Duessa and the Red Cross Knight, and Mr By-ends (with his distinguished circle of relations) and Hopeful and Mrs Timorous (with her coterie of gossips, Mrs Inconsiderate and Mrs Lightmind) and Mrs Knownothing! Spenser's characters represent almost wholly abstract virtues and qualities, and his book is 'an epic of the struggles and triumph of truth'; whereas Bunyan, like Chaucer, drew personal portraits and gave concrete presentations of virtues and vices. Many, indeed, of Bunyan's shrewd, pointed remarks about his characters, and the pungent marginal notes in which he sometimes indulges, bear a distinct resemblance to Chaucer's terse and humorous 'summings-up' of the 'Canterbury Pilgrims'.

Bunyan is eminently happy in his names of persons and places. To take a few examples at random: 'Mr Worldly Wiseman,' 'the brisk lad Ignorance from the town of Conceit,' 'Mr Facing-both-ways,' 'a young woman her name was Dull,' 'Flesh Lane, right opposite to the Church,' illustrate his felicity in this respect. But his characters are developed as well as they are named, some merely by a few deft touches, others more fully by means of dialogue. As Lowell has well said: 'The long nights of Bedford Jail had so intensified his imagination and made the figures with which it peopled his solitude so real to him that the creatures of his mind became things as clear to memory as if he had seen them.' Sometimes, indeed, we lose sight of the allegory in a long moral discourse and are tired by the somewhat tedious digressions, but, like the 'sermons' and essays in Thackeray's novels, they all contribute to the general effect of the book and enhance its ultimate charm.

There is another very important aspect of *Pilgrim's Progress*. Although it is an allegory, intended rather to help and instruct than to amuse, it is also the prototype of the English novel, to which it has the same relation as the old Moralities had to the legitimate drama. It has every one of the four requisites for a novel: plot, character, description, and dialogue. In places, indeed, it ceases to be an allegory and becomes a novel. A good example of this is the conversation between Old Honest and Mr Standfast about Madam Bubble. After Standfast has described his meeting with Madam Bubble, the dialogue continues:

HONEST: Without doubt her designs were bad. But stay, now you talk of her me-thinks I either have seen her or have read some story of her.

STANDFAST: Perhaps you have done both.

HONEST: Madam Bubble? Is she not a tall, comely dame, somewhat of a swarthy complexion?

STANDFAST: Right, you hit it; she is just such a one.

HONEST: Does she not speak very smoothly, and give you a smile at the end of the sentence?

STANDFAST: You fall right upon it again, for these are her very actions.

HONEST: Doth she not wear a great purse by her side, and is not her hand often in it, fingering her money, as if that were her heart's delight?

STANDFAST: 'Tis just so. Had she stood by all this while, you would not more amply have set her forth before me, nor have better described her features.

The Life and Death of Mr Badman, which was published in 1680, was intended to be a complement to *Pilgrim's Progress*. It is a 'Pilgrim's Progress to Hell'. Bunyan was terrified by the general dissoluteness of the times, and by painting the horrors of a sinner's life and death he sought to deter others from following Mr Badman to his place of eternal punishment. 'Let those who would not die Mr Badman's death take heed of Mr Badman's ways, for his ways bring to his ends; wickedness will not deliver him that is given to it, though he should cloak all with a profession of religion.' The story of Mr Badman's downward career is interwoven with innumerable short sermons and didactic discourses on such subjects as stealing, drunkenness, and impurity. Noteworthy among these digressions is the story of 'Old Tod', which so impressed Browning that he wrote the poem *Ned Bratts* about it. But the underlying note of the whole book is a note of warning, warning against evil living and the punishment which will surely follow. '*Dieu me pardonnera*,' said Heine on his deathbed, '*. . . c'est son métier*.' But to Bunyan the terrors of hell are real, as real as his popular conception of Apollyon.

After *Pilgrim's Progress*, *The Holy War* is the most memorable of Bunyan's works. But although, according to the well-known view of Macaulay, if *Pilgrim's Progress* did not exist *The Holy War* would be the best allegory ever written, it contrasts very unfavourably with Bunyan's earlier book. It is an overloaded fable of the fall and ultimate recovery of mankind, written at very great length, lacking in personal interest and often tedious, uninspiring, and monotonous. Moreover, as has been pointed out, its conclusion is too much like the closing chapter of *Rasselas*, 'a conclusion in which nothing is concluded'. Nevertheless this work has many pleasing characteristics, not the least among which are its quaint phrases and mannerisms of style.

During the years of the Revolution there was a kind of literary hiatus, one result of which was that the few great writers of that period belonged to no particular school. The three great prose writers at this time were Bunyan, Swift, and Defoe, and it is a notable fact that the man who had the least educational advantages was the greatest creative genius of the three. Taine has said that Bunyan was 'poor in ideas, rich in images'; and it is certainly true that he lived in a very limited circle of ideas. What, then, are the peculiar qualities which raise Bunyan's works as far above those of George Fox and Roger L'Estrange as Shakespeare's plays are above the plays of Greene and Kyd and the other Elizabethan dramatists? The secret of his success lay in his imaginative powers and his knowledge of men—'the drop of precious elixir which nature infused into his eyes at birth, as into those of such different people as Geoffrey Chaucer and Jane Austen'.

Few authors have been so little influenced by secular literature as Bunyan. He stands equally aloof from current events—nowhere in his works do we find any reference to the Great Plague or the Great Fire, or to the ascendancy of Cromwell and the restoration of Charles the Second. Nevertheless, he has been accused of plagiarism. It is indeed possible that *Pilgrim's Progress* was partly

inspired or influenced by De Guileville, and by such books as Dunbar's *Golden Targe* and Stephen Hawes's *Passeytyme of Pleasure*. There are also unmistakable traces of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* in Bunyan's account of the trial and death of Faithful. However, he has himself told us that he did not take his work from anybody, but that it came from himself alone.

Manner and matter, too, was all my own.
The whole and every whit is mine.

The Bible was the one great source of Bunyan's inspiration. His pure biblical phraseology, varied by the homely colloquialisms of his dialogue, comes in strange and pleasant contrast to the straining after fantastic and ingenious conceits which characterized most writers of his time. It was to the Bible also that he owed the rhythmical structure of his prose, and from the Bible that he drew 'those maxims—*certa vita dogmata*—which Spinoza advises us to commit to memory and constantly to apply in the particular cases which frequently meet us in life'. In fine, Bunyan taught a literary as well as a moral lesson. The sober rhythm of his style, his mastery of the short sentence, his admirable character-painting and the vividness and pictorial glow of his narrative, all conferred an incalculable boon on the host of novelists and essay writers who followed him. But in Bunyan's own eyes the literary side of his writings was as nothing compared with their moral significance. Not that he was a great exponent of moral law. He did not, like Aeschylus, try to 'justify the ways of God to man'; he tried rather to show with perfect clearness and simplicity how Man—not Puritan man, but Man—might gain a moral victory over the material and spiritual temptations which are set in his path through life. He did for Protestantism what Dante did for Roman Catholicism—he invested it with a romance and a vitality which had never been discovered in the broken cisterns of dogma and theology.

C. KENT WRIGHT

JOSUA STEGMANN

AND HE SHALL have dominion' is not yet an accomplished fact; but the coming of that most blessed domination has been furthered by men and women in all ages, of every rank and condition. Not the least worthy in so noble an army have been the writers of our hymns. One needs only to recall the stories of heroes of the faith like Heermann and Gerhardt, Rinckart and Rothe, to see with what gladness those hard pressed in the tempest of life have 'offered gifts' to Him whose 'name shall be continued as long as the sun'. From the list of such confessors the name of Josua Stegmann is one that should never be omitted.

There is as yet no authoritative biography of Stegmann and the records of his life we possess are principally to be found in original MSS. still guarded at Rinteln, where his main work was done. In what follows I am much indebted to Pastor H. Noltenius of Rinteln, to Studienrat W. Niendorf of Berlin, and particularly to the able editor of the *Schaumburger Zeitung*, Herr Franz Brock, who kindly hunted out and forwarded me eight invaluable numbers of the *Zeitung* for 1932 (Stegmann's tercentenary year) and with them an admirable reproduction of the only known portrait of the hymn-writer.

Josua Stegmann was born in 1588 in the village of Sulzfeld near Meiningen on the southern fringe of the Thüringerwald, a region which has contributed not a little to German literature. Of his father, '*clarissimus et doctissimus vir*,' and pastor of Sulzfeld, we possess some information; of his mother Rebekka we know practically nothing—a wide-spread destruction of Church Registers was certainly one of the major accomplishments of the Thirty Years War. At the age of nineteen Josua entered the very Lutheran University of Leipzig. His studies in theology and philosophy were by no means purely academic: from the outset he took a keen part in the then current polemic with the Calvinists and, in spite of his frail bodily presence, he had soon to be reckoned with as a most eloquent and spirited opponent of Calvinistic and Socinian errors. The disputations in which he took part were all public and of course in Latin (it was not till 1687 that Thomasius, a well-known professor and writer, dared in that same university to be the first to give a course of lectures in *German!*). One present at such a debate speaks with veneration of Stegmann's 'wide learning and profound piety'.

In 1617 he was appointed Professor in Theology in the Gymnasium of Stadthagen, a Gymnasium already almost of university rank, for it possessed thirteen 'Chairs' and gave instruction in four different faculties. His presence in Wittenberg in October of that year, at the Centenary of Luther's famous theses, brought him a second, much valued, degree, the Wittenberg doctorate in divinity. In the following year he married Margarite Bernhardi, the widow of his predecessor, a woman who proved herself to be a tower of strength to the somewhat diffident scholar she had married. Before long the Gymnasium actually became a university, being transplanted to the neighbouring town of Rinteln on the Weser, in the very heart of the beautiful Lippe scenery where the last all-important years of his life were to be spent. One who knows it well calls it a region 'whose beauty causes one's heart to stand still and where God's

peace steals down from the hills into one's innermost being'. We are thankful at least that his life had that background, for peace upon earth he was not to know and it was there that he met with pain, privations, and an early death.

At the opening of the University of Rinteln in July 1621 (it lasted until Napoleon wiped it out in 1809) Stegmann preached the inaugural Sermon, which we still possess. In it he likened such a school of learning to Paradise! It had four Faculties, as Paradise had four rivers. Its students were young trees of life 'which ever need shaping and pruning, grafting and replanting'. Its professors were gardeners whose one obligation and objective was to make that part of Germany blossom as the garden of the Lord. But from its very first days the enterprise was overshadowed by the rigours of the War. In a letter he wrote in December of that year we read: 'May God give throughout all Germany peace in the New Year.' It was twenty-seven long pitiful years before his prayer was granted!

As the War extended nation-wide, the work of the young university suffered constant interruption. Duke Christian of Brunswick, King Christian of Denmark, the unspeakable and notorious Tilly himself, brought pillaging, plundering troops through it or against it. No slight credit is due to Stegmann, the Rector of the university, in that, through innumerable discouragements and hardship, he worked tirelessly for its settlement and stabilization. In 1623 he was forced to go into temporary exile and writes: 'We still hover between hope and fear. . . . Every town, every village echoes to the tramp of soldiers. On all sides we see misery, pain, and starvation.' In 1628 his beloved wife died, leaving him with two quite young daughters (his only son had died in infancy). And the days grew ever darker. 'This is a time', he writes again, 'when truth is down-trodden, falsehood is on the throne, and in gloomy twilight everything augurs the coming of a night of misery. . . . It is a time when every promising project is brought to nought and when those two grimmest of monosyllables, death and war, turn everything upside down.'

He was right. A 'night of misery' was about to descend upon the Protestant Churches. After the utter defeat of Christian of Denmark, the Kaiser (Ferdinand the Second), now in possession of all North Germany, felt himself strong enough to promulgate the Restitution Edict, which not only crippled every Lutheran activity but threatened to erase the Church of the Reformation altogether. By this Edict all properties and goods which had belonged to the Roman Catholics up to the year 1552 must now be handed back to them. Practically every Lutheran church, college, and institution, was housed in buildings which seventy-five years earlier had belonged to the Catholics; those in which the new University of Rinteln had been established were formerly a Romish nunnery. In 1630 imperial envoys were sent round, one of them the dreaded Bishop of Osnabrück, and the entire university was awarded by them to the Benedictine Order. The professors were forced to leave their quarters in the university and hand them over to the monks; where this was not done promptly enough, soldiers knowing neither restraint nor decency were billeted upon them. Stegmann not only had to quit house and library but also was ordered to repay to the monks all the money he had received as salary before 1629! Well might he write at this time: 'If God does not intervene, our Church will disappear.'

Yet in spite of such contrariety he laboured on. His lectures he still delivered, either in the church or in the house to which he had migrated. For a brief moment he dared to hope. 1630 was an important year, often described as the watershed of the War. It saw the landing in Pomerania of Gustavus Adolphus, with a strong Swedish army to support the Protestant cause. (Hymn-lovers cannot forget that in it appeared the hymns of Heermann, Stegmann's most famous hymn, and, if Nelle's very weighty authority may be relied on, Rinkart's 'Now thank we all our God'.) But after conquering North-east Germany, Gustavus unfortunately marched toward Bavaria and the South, and North-west Germany remained in Roman Catholic hands and Rinteln in those of the Benedictines. For over eighteen months a state of almost unbearable tension prevailed. In July 1632 matters came to a head. It was arranged that a formal disputation should take place between the monks and the dispossessed university staff. Almost all the professors declined to take any part in this discussion, which was upon 'The Calling of the Servants of the Church of Christ'; Stegmann however felt constrained to accept the monks' challenge, which had been particularly addressed to himself. Alone he marched into the Great Hall of the university, which he found crowded with the Benedictines, their supporters and advisers, and a considerable number of troops.

The disputation was opened by a monk who, by skilful use of isolated passages of Scripture (notably John 10¹, Romans 10¹⁴ and Hebrews 5⁴), proved the complete invalidity of Lutheran orders. Luther's only true orders were those he had received from the Pope; when he violated these, his word had no authority whatever and his followers, creeping in by 'some other way', were nothing but 'thieves and robbers'. When Stegmann rose to reply he was repeatedly howled down, interrupted by cat-calls, heckling on all sides, stamping of feet, roars of laughter, and mock applause. Clearly the idea was to smother him with derision. When he was able to make himself heard however, he spoke to such purpose ('the *door* of the sheep is not a bishop but Jesus Christ') that the meeting was suddenly dismissed by a gruff order from the chairman: 'Now we must all go to Mass.'

Stegmann returned to his lonely home. Did he think, one wonders, of his own hymn, the first verse of which, literally translated, exactly fitted the situation: 'Abide among us with Thy Grace, Lord Jesus Christ, that the trickery of our wicked enemies may nevermore harm us'? But the strain of the ordeal had gone to his heart. He was attacked by fever and in less than three weeks after the disgraceful proceedings he died (3rd August 1632). Even in the grave his enemies' spite pursued him and it was given out that during the dispute he had been guilty of gross ignorance of theology and of the Latin tongue—this latter fault one of the last with which he could ever have been charged.

In 1630 Stegmann had published that one of his many volumes which was reprinted again and again before the end of the War: *Erneuerte Herzensseufzer*, a devotional collection of prayers and hymns for the distressed. Something of the temper of the man can be better seen by one of these prayers than by any description: 'Lord, who hast laid this burden of war upon us, it is Thou who must grant us the strength to bear it. We will not cease to plead except Thou hear us and when Thou hearest not, still will we call the more importunately upon Thee. . . . In the end Thou wilt bring us relief and should this misery

even then endure, it shall be for ever buried in our graves. Then shalt Thou bring us to Thy home of peace and safety, where all we have struggled for will be wrought for us and where we shall receive openly that for which in this life we could do no more than yearn.'

Parts of this book were drawn from external sources but in that part which he composed himself, pride of place is taken by his hymn: '*Ach bleib mit Deiner Gnade.*' Just as his contemporary, Rinckart, wrote his masterly 'Now thank we all our God' as a three-versed grace before meat, that each of his little children might repeat a verse of it, so Stegmann wrote this, the greatest of his hymns, as a simple pendant to a long prayer for the protection of the Church. Some of his prayers may seem to us at times somewhat circumlocutory, but this slender verse-prayer is terse, to the point, understandable as a cry for help by learned and unlearned alike. Many were the hymns minted by suffering during this pitiless war: Dr Johann Rist, the Hamburg poet, himself an old student of Rinteln, spoke for a brave and numerous company when he asserted: 'The dear Cross hath pressed many sweet songs out of me.' It is one of the gains of this last century that today we can sing in our own tongue: 'Abide among us with Thy grace.'

Although it had already been included in a few English hymnals, it was the inclusion of this hymn of Stegmann's in the *Methodist Hymn-book* of 1904 which first brought it into common use among us. Since then it has constantly won more favour and today is attaining something of the wide circulation and deep affection it has long enjoyed in its homeland. It was the favourite hymn of Frederick the Fourth of Prussia; I have heard it sung at midnight in a huge farmhouse kitchen in the forest of Coburg as their best-loved evening hymn. Its six artless verses are known wherever German is spoken, and Miss Winkworth's excellent translation has made it familiar to a large part of our Anglo-Saxon world. With regard to her translation, it might be suggested that verse 3, lines 3 and 4 are capable of improvement, and that v. 5, l. 4 is almost padding; but the brilliant inversion of v. 6, ll. 3 and 4 and the way in which the atmosphere of the whole lyric is conveyed, more than atone for these minor defects. The result is a weighty argument in favour of the claim that in translating German hymns Miss Winkworth comes second only to John Wesley.

The keynote of '*Ach bleib mit Deiner Gnade*' is evidently the supplication of the Emmaus disciples, 'Abide with us, for it is toward evening,' and this root motif is developed and articulated into a five-fold request that the Lord's presence may be manifested through His Word, His light, His blessing, His protection, and His faithfulness. These petitions stand out with a new realism and a poignant simplicity as history reveals to us their dark background of lawlessness, oppression, and bloodshed. Few hymns are less complicated or more ingenuous, direct, and inspired.

Josua Stegmann was a man of unassumed piety; those are true words upon his gravestone at Rinteln: 'A man without ostentation and without guile.' He lived for his students, his Church, and his Redeemer. In patience he endured great tribulation—the break-up of his family life, the loss of his goods, the contempt of his gifts and his person. His fine scholarship was ever devoted to the truth as he saw it and for this he strove night and day as long as life lasted. He was a somewhat delicate plant in the garden of the Lord. Brutality

of speech and behaviour he could never understand, and it is to the harsh rudeness of his opponents that his early death must be largely attributed. He had nothing of the lusty vigour of a Luther nor the purposeful aloofness of an Erasmus. But he had persistence and enormous perseverance, though in a feeble body. Conscience, not subservience to temporal power, was his law. In his infinite distress he knew of no other resource than to turn to the Master whom he loved. The words surrounding his memorial in the Nicolai Kirche at Rinteln are words exactly befitting this noble witness to Christian freedom and Christian confidence: 'The teachers shall shine as the splendour of the heavens and they who point many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.'¹

SYDNEY H. MOORE

¹ Luther's version of Daniel 12¹.

Ecumenical Survey *

COMMUNICATED THROUGH THE REV. PHILIP S. WATSON, M.A.

AFTER OXFORD?—ECUMENICAL METHODISM AND THE FUTURE

SOME MONTHS ago the American *Christian Century* protested against the growth of what we may call 'ecumenical denominationalism', world assemblies of Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Methodists. It complained that this was simply 'Internationalized Sectarianism'. We know what was meant: a world sect, a denominational world huddle, concerned with sectarian idiosyncrasies, principles petrified into prejudices, convictions ossified into a narrow party line, rigid, inflexible, and unable to get through its own introspective concerns to the outside world in its distraught and desperate needs—an 'Internationalized Sect' in this sense would be a very horrid thing. The danger of it comes home to most of us when we look at the programme or listen to the doings of some such denominational assembly which is not our own. It takes an effort of imagination to realize that the very fervour and comradeship which we anticipate from the Ecumenical Conference at Oxford may seem like this to non-Methodists, and set their minds on edge. Perhaps behind the reproach of the *Christian Century* was another concern. Is there not a possibility that this 'ecumenical denominationalism' will prejudice two of the most hopeful Christian tendencies of our time: the tendency toward reunion in separate countries (what we may call the vertical movement) and the movement (what we may call the horizontal movement) focused in the World Council of Churches? These are real dangers. But it has been well said, that 'danger' is the favourite word of the second-rate theologian. We may ask those who think with the *Christian Century*: Are we to leave this world-wide Christianity to the Anglicans and to the Romans? 'Internationalized Sectarianism' may be a very horrid thing, but is not 'Catholicity' one of the loveliest habiliments of the Bride of Christ?

None the less, I think it well to begin by considering as plainly as possible the very strong case that can be made out for 'playing down' any emphasis on Ecumenical Methodism at present, and for regarding it as an interim movement destined to disappear when the larger Methodist bodies unite with other Protestants in their own countries.

I. THE CASE AGAINST ECUMENICAL DENOMINATIONALISM

In the preparatory discussions toward the Oxford Conference it was suggested that in order to re-assess the meaning of the Methodist Tradition in the modern world, three questions must be asked. The first: 'What were we?'—Where did we come in, in Church history, and what did God give us to be, to say, and to do, in the creative moment of our origin? Second: 'What have we become?'—What has happened to the diversities of Methodism during the hundred and fifty years in which we have gone our separate ways since the death of John

Wesley? When we have compared our answers to these questions, we might be better fitted to face the third: 'What must we do?'—What is to be the future of this Methodist tradition in the modern world and Church situation?

It may fairly be argued that in assessing the Methodist tradition, 'What have we become?' is more important than 'What were we?' The eighteenth-century impress upon modern Methodism in England and in America has worn very thin, and seems far less operative than the influences deriving from successive nineteenth-century revivals, which found their norm in the 'Second Great Awakening' (1850-70). In England a fact of enormous importance was the growing together, in the last half of the Victorian Age, of the Nonconformist Churches, an historic and fruitful alliance which resulted in an approximation in piety and worship, in theological and ethical emphasis.

It can further be urged that the only Methodist tradition is the living, continuing life of the Methodist people, as it has come to be at this point in time. The Methodist tradition is not therefore something which the antiquarians, Church historians, theologians, and romantics, can recapture for us, by ferreting among books and liturgies, or by re-thinking, re-stating, re-assessing Methodist doctrines (which often means dressing our modern convictions in eighteenth-century clothes, selecting what seems pertinent to our 1951 situation, and seeing what we can find in Wesley's hymns and Sermons which can be made to fit!). We cannot go 'Back to Wesley', or to some reconstructed 'Original Methodism'. If we try, it will be with us, in Fr Thornton's brilliant illustration, as with the men who tried to get at H. G. Wells' 'Invisible Man' by removing layer after layer of his clothes, until they took off the last layer and with that deed, made him completely disappear. That way lies romanticism or antiquarianism, and it can be argued that the eighteenth-century Methodist '*depositum*' has neither the dogmatic nor the liturgical root which has made the movements of neo-orthodoxy and the revival of liturgies so fruitful in the life of the historic Churches of our time. Christian movements, it might be said, can be at the mercy of their first two generations, or of their last two, but we cannot have it both ways, and Methodism it seems has chosen the latter alternative, and has reached the point where any Methodist counterpart of the Oxford Movement can only be a perilous failure. Those who think in this way would not deny the possibility that some elements in that historic tradition may be fruitfully revived: the 'optimism of Grace' which marked Evangelical Arminianism, elements of the great fourfold Methodist framework of 'our doctrines', 'our discipline', 'our hymns', and 'our literature'.

But, we repeat, the eighteenth-century impress is only faintly to be discerned upon the great majority of the Methodist ministry and hardly exists for the great mass of the laity, and is certainly not to be compared with the influence of evangelical pietism and twentieth-century common-denominator Nonconformity.

Thus, there are areas in England and America where a man can enter a Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, or Presbyterian Church, and unless told, could hardly guess the denomination from the service or the sermon (the parson might distinguish subtle distinctions, but the layman would not notice them at all). We must face the fact that millions of men and women have grown up in this common evangelical Protestant tradition (the cleft between fundamentalists

and others cuts across the denominations). When the Methodist moves from one area to another he can settle down as a Congregationalist, and the Baptist or Congregationalist becomes easily acclimatized to Methodism. Those who minister to such mixed congregations, or who face the problem of deploying limited Christian resources in new housing areas will understand the strength of the appeal, 'Why not drop these labels? Are not our common possessions the only important things? At any rate does not the only intelligible message to our age stem from this common heritage?' Here is a strong impulse toward what we have called the 'vertical' movement toward reunion. Such unions have already taken place, as in Canada, South India, and in the Reformed Church of France. Links and contact with the former mother Churches have continued, but one wonders whether they will survive the first 'ex'-generation. And again, one can understand, especially in the Younger Churches of the Far East, a distrust of ecumenical denominationalism, as likely to perpetuate the idiosyncrasies of English Church history. 'Tradition?' might they not Christianly say: 'God is able to make new traditions, who gave us our former witness. God is able in His bounty and goodness to give us new treasures in the future, the glories of a united Christian witness which will in time outstrip in splendour all the rich and many-sided wonders of the first short two thousand years of Church history—how much more the hundred and fifty years of Methodism?'

These arguments contain real truth and rest upon stubborn facts. There are strong tides flowing in the history of our age and of the Church which support the view that the vertical movement toward reunion must mean the end of ecumenical denominationalism.

There is finally the fact that our Methodisms have grown apart in the last hundred and fifty years. It is one of the qualities of 'Catholicity' that the Church of Christ is able to take on the colours of the most disparate cultures, to assimilate them, to become immersed in them (though it is tragedy and apostasy to become submerged by them). It is entirely right that over a large part of its Church life American Methodism should express the middle-class American Way of Life, as the German Methodists are noticeably German, and the British, British. Only in this way could a genuine Christian witness be maintained, and such cultural colouring is the result not of Christian failure, but of the success of baptizing a new people into the Christian Gospel. But we must face the fact that one result is that the American Methodist may be pardoned for feeling that an American Congregationalist is nearer to him in many ways than an English Methodist beyond many thousand miles of ocean: an English Methodist may be pardoned for feeling that English Anglicanism (though not American Episcopalianism) or English Congregationalism (though not American Congregationalism) would be a more congenial home to him than American, German, South American, or Japanese Methodism. And here, again, is part of the strong impetus toward vertical reunion.

On the other hand, two important cross-currents of our age have to be noted. The first is that the peak ideological strength of the vertical movement seems to have been in the period between the wars. At least, since then, we have become painfully conscious of the global problems of the world and of the Church. The questions asked most desperately of the Church are not those which are soluble on national or racial or continental lines. Indeed, one wonders

whether a Church contained within one nation, race, culture, or class—especially the middle class—has much chance of effective witness in the coming century? The claims of 'Catholicity' therefore seem paramount.

The second is the well-attested fact that the ecumenical movement centred in the World Council of Churches has been accompanied by a growing stimulation, and indeed demand for more explicit confessional witness. Officers of the World Council of Churches have often commented on the fact that experiments in ecumenical conversation have invariably strengthened interest and new awareness of the special witness of one's own confession. (The fact is complex, of course, for behind this there stands the whole theological trend sometimes called 'neo-orthodoxy'.)

There are those who admit these facts, but urge that they are met by the wider Ecumenical movement. The World Council of Churches is far better fitted, they say, than Ecumenical Denominationalism to speak to one world on behalf of the common Christian conscience. The World Council of Churches, they say, is the apt framework for confessional witness, the only safe guarantee that the new emphasis on distinctive tradition will not mean a revival of rigid sectarianism, but will mean an enrichment of all within the tension and dialectic of the ecumenical conversation.

If we admit the elements of truth in the foregoing arguments, and recognize that whether we like it or not, they correspond to real facts, and that these movements toward reunion—vertical within several nations and horizontally in the Ecumenical movement—will continue, what can we envisage for the future of Ecumenical Methodism?

2. ECUMENICAL METHODISM, CATHOLICITY, 'FULL COMMUNION'

First, we refuse the alternative 'Either—Or'. We believe that Methodists can participate loyally in reunion conversations in their own land, can work ardently for the Ecumenical Movement, and that they can best serve these high purposes, not by weakening but by strengthening the ties and loyalties that bind the Methodist people across the world. Even if we supposed, to go beyond the evidence, that in the next thirty years, great bodies of American or British Methodists would melt into United Protestant Churches in their own lands, it would still be our duty to use the interval to strengthen and enrich our joint heritage and responsibilities.

I find the core of my argument in the phrase 'Full Communion'. World Methodism is the one great body with which we, as separate Methodist Communions, are in 'Full Communion' without hindrances and barriers. There are great differences between these Methodisms. An English Methodist who makes a list of distinctive features of his Methodism which he would be loth to see disappear, would be apt to include: the Conference with its ethos as distinct as that of the House of Commons or the Anglican Convocation; the Presidency with its unique combination of the dignity and brotherhood of the Ministry; the ministry which has achieved something nearer equality of stipend and work than most Churches, and has been spared something of the touting for preferment which poisons some ministries; the ministry of the laity as an integral part of the life of Methodism; the inestimable value of the class-meeting or group cell. Yet some, or all, of these features are absent

from some other branches of Methodism which in their turn could no doubt list precious characteristics of their Methodism which are not to be found in Britain.

Yet Methodists have that in common which is more important than all differences. I know that what is called the 'Ecumenical Experience' is a marvellous thing. From my own experience in devastated Berlin in 1945 and in Amsterdam, I know that when members of long-separated communions stand together to show a broken world that theirs is a fellowship which spans barrier, race, and class, then such witness is a sacrament through which grace is given. The Methodist 'Ecumenical Experience' is equally real, but more spontaneous, more immediate. To put it bluntly: theologically I may have more in common with some Anglican and some Lutheran friends than with many German and American Methodists; I may have deep personal friendships with Anglicans or Lutherans; yet on a Confessional footing it is with the Methodists that in personal encounter I can really be 'at home'. It was Thomas Jackson who said that he enjoyed communion with Anglicans indeed, but unfortunately only with dead Anglicans, on his bookshelves and in his study. I may be a Methodist minister in an English village for five years and never get beyond chilly, formal, and patronized discussion with an Anglican Rector, and find a deeper Christian friendship in three minutes with a Red Indian Methodist. There is a reason. Long ago the Cherokee Indians made their trails through the pine-covered hills for their own purposes, but in the fullness of time there came, beautiful upon those mountains, the feet of him that published good tidings, a plain Englishman, Francis Asbury. That Cherokee trail was part of a path which began with a rolling English road, winding its way from Epworth to Oxford, and doubling back to Aldersgate Street, but which does not end before Zion's Gate. This common providential way spans the globe and along it Methodists may travel without let or hindrance. The Methodists of Hastings, Harrisburg, Houston, and Hiroshima, of Bristol, Bremen, and Boston, of Melbourne, Mexico, and Manchester, enjoy 'Full Communion'. It is harder for Methodists than for some other communions to define this common bond, for we have no doctrinaire notions of Church polity, no outward forms or formularies which are divisively distinctive and with which to un-Church fellow Christians. The Methodist temper is described in John Wesley's noble sermon 'Of a Catholic Spirit'. That in the experience of meeting fellow Methodists the bond becomes apparent, is testimony to this common living tradition, which is partnership between past and present, and in which this present generation is simply the fraction of an iceberg which shows upon the face of the waters, sustained and balanced by unseen, hidden depths.

This is not to ride off sentimentally from the cogent arguments we have tried to meet. Those who would play down Ecumenical Methodism are those who evade realities. To suggest that we can neglect this 'Full Communion' with our fellow Methodists, that we should allow it to lapse, to weaken, and to die, the more easily to serve the cause of a United Protestant Church in one country or to serve the Ecumenical Movement in the World, is to betray a fundamentally un-Christian approach to the problems of Christian reunion, and indeed to the whole notion of the Catholic Church.

It is the sin of imagining we can love our brother whom we have not seen

—save through the dark glass of long division, by turning our back on our brother whom we have seen—joined with us by the deepest ties of spiritual origin. This is the plain answer to those who query our fraternizing. These Methodists are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. To point beyond this living tradition to some other which is not yet, and to weaken the one for the sake of the other, however urgent and real the call to further adventure may be, must be recognized in the most solemn sense of the word as—temptation. At the end of the War, British Methodism did well, when, seeking to co-operate with all the Churches in the work of Christian reconstruction in Europe, it recognized a special responsibility toward fellow Methodists, and set up a committee to strengthen the links binding British Methodism to the Methodists of the Continent. An 'Ecumenicity' which has no roots in denominational loyalties, means in the end a rootless Ecumenical Movement, cut off from the living springs of Christian tradition which are real, existing, worshipping communities of Christian men and women.

I have said that Methodists all over the world have the rights of 'Full Communion' with one another. But such exchange of life and fellowship meets the hindrances of separation, the physical fact of distance, the separating paths of the cultures and nations in which the Churches have their being. The Ecumenical Methodist Conferences exist to help overcome these difficulties. And many would say that we have all been impoverished by too much separation. A closer contact between the two major Methodist traditions of Britain and America might have made us both stronger to face our distinctive tasks at the present time. It is here that the phrase 'Full Communion' becomes a challenge to the future.

We all know the traditional comfortable word said to a mother on her daughter's wedding day: 'You must think, not that you have lost a daughter, but have gained a son.' Supposing when one of the reunions takes place in the future, when, say, the Italian Methodists become part of an Italian Protestant Church, that they could really say and mean to that larger Church, not, 'Today we begin to loosen the ties that bound us to Methodism', but 'Today we are bringing the Italian Protestant Church into Full Communion with World Methodism—a Full Communion which we intend to maintain and to develop in every possible way'?

For this really to be possible demands an alertness and discipline in Methodism which would summon up all its powers and energies. It would demand not only a maximum interpretation of 'Full Communion' between Methodists, but that genuine Catholic spirit which would take us forward into the new adventures in Christian fellowship across the world. In such a Church we should not need to be anxious or take thought for the survival of our tradition, for it would be ever enriched from within, and it would find new life in giving itself away. But we have to recognize that we are far from enjoying 'Full Communion' within World Methodism in this sense, and the practical steps taken at Oxford should remedy this situation.

What follows here are some possible lines of action. They are a purely personal view, and though some of them will very likely be implemented, others will almost certainly not. But they belong to the argument I have been trying to develop.

1. The Ecumenical Conference might solemnly resolve, or reaffirm its conviction, that the 'Methodists are one people', might pass the resolution to the several Methodist Conferences for action, and might set up machinery to implement it. Though nobody is likely to propose the Reunion of World Methodism (there is more to be said for it than most of us are willing to admit), at least a closer measure of integration can be sought and attained. 'Integration' may be less than reunion, but it involves a much closer communion than we have realized at present.

2. As the great alliances of the political world are followed by staff talks at the technical level, we might hope that between 1951 and the next Ecumenical Conference there will be a real interchange of information and experiment. There should be visits and conferences of experts at which missions (how little do most American or British Methodists know of the great mission-fields of the other?), educational programmes, ministerial training, and their various kinds of literature, tools, and technique, can be compared. We may take it for granted that the already fruitful interchange of ministers, teachers, and visits by students and young people, will be extended.

3. The strengthening of inter-communion between Methodists means an interchange of theological and liturgical inquiry and experiment. We shall need a clearing-house for information, and this is especially important in regard to reunion movements. While no Ecumenical Methodist committee has, or would wish to have right of action, it is part of the decencies of Christian brotherhood that we should keep one another informed, and indeed that there should be conference between Methodists of the world about the deep principles at stake in matters of reunion.

4. No doubt an Ecumenical Methodist secretariat in New York, London, or Geneva, will be formed. There are sound practical reasons for this which are not to be despised. The late Dr J. R. Temple, who was suspicious of some forms of Denominational Ecumenicity, told me that he was bound to say that if Ecumenical Methodism had an organization and a secretariat comparable with say, World Lutheranism, it would get more attention in some quarters. This may sound a purely ecclesiastical argument but those who live in countries where Methodism is a tiny minority will not undervalue its importance. There are two drawbacks. First, the difficulty of getting a really first-rate person to be spared for the job. Second, that it is strengthening the bureaucratic element which is already so dangerously powerful in the Ecumenical Movement, and indeed in modern Christianity in the West. It would be a bad thing if all that resulted from Oxford were a permanent secretariat.

5. 'Full Communion' does not imply a closed-shop attitude. Indeed it is time that Methodism was more aggressively Christian in its foreign policy. Here the Anglican Church is far ahead of the British Free Churches. For a long time the Church of England has had its Foreign Relations Committee. When leaders and theologians of the varying Continental traditions come to England they are met by members of the appropriate and interested group within the Church of England. The Church of England carries on important conferences with German and Scandinavian and Orthodox Churches. It is a pity that English Free Churches so often are content with the Protestant tradition within English Christianity. Yet in many ways the Reformed and Lutheran heritage is more deeply imbibed in the Free Churches and Methodist, than in the Anglican Church. It might be salutary for Methodists to explore the meaning of 'Full Communion' in conversations with Calvinists and Lutherans. This would not be without its bearing on the English situation, since the Anglican tradition has been always to be more accommodating to European Protestants than to the English Free Churches, and a genuine 'Full Communion' of Methodism with the Church of Scotland, the Church of France, the German Calvinists, and an approach to the Lutheran Churches might have far-reaching results.

It is the difficulty about the Ecumenical Methodist Council as of the British Free Church Council and of the World Council of Churches, that such bodies can only speak with the moral authority of their message, that they do not possess sovereignty. In this sense it is true that the Church of Rome is the only really international and world-wide Church which possesses sovereignty. Yet that need not be a bar to the effectiveness of the Ecumenical Methodist witness. For it can remind us, that in a profound sense, the Church does not possess sovereignty; that the sovereign is the Lord of the Church present and reigning in her midst. In the end, not the American General Conference nor the British Conference, nor the other separate Methodist assemblies can decide and plan our Providential Way.

It is this sovereign Lord who draws us together, who will not suffer us to abuse His gifts by hugging them selfishly to ourselves, who High and Lifted up is always directing our tardy attention to the sheep who are not yet of the fold, and to the children of God who are scattered abroad. It is the final blow to all our parochialisms, that He will smash them with the Word of His mouth, our follies, our apostasies, our trivialities, our half truths, and all our truths, except the last truth, that there is upon the earth one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church because there is one Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world. 'Full Communion' dare not stop short of that Catholicity.

Love, like death, hath all destroyed,
Rendered all distinctions void;
Names, and sects, and parties fall:
Thou, O Christ, art all in all.

GORDON RUPP

Notes and Discussions

THE NEED FOR A WORLD PHILOSOPHY

IT IS NOW abundantly clear that mankind has reached, if not a breakdown, at least a crisis of civilization (to use Mr Arnold Toynbee's convenient terms). East is now commonly opposed to West in popular and even in scholarly speech. Yet it is not evident why this should be so. For there is no geographical or historical line of demarcation between East and West, and no ideological one either, as a study of the recent book on Radhakrishnan amply shows. Is Russia, a Northern power lying midway between Europe and Asia, a Western or an Eastern nation? Is Spain or Israel or Persia? And what of the new Commonwealth, which as a political entity contains the United Kingdom, much of Africa, India, and Australasia? Evidently the opposition into East versus West is a false simplification, and one likely to lead to confusion and strife. But just as mistaken is the attempt to treat the globe as One World politically or socially or ideologically, for evidently the truth is that it is only striving to become so, against many kinds of old divisions of a cultural or religious or political sort. We must recognize the fact that there is not now, any more than there has ever been, anything more than a mixture of diverse ways of life and thought, and that a systematic unity of them is beyond our present attainment or indeed capacity. This conclusion, however distressing to the tidy mind, is all too plain, and yet probably congenial to the piece-meal way of British thinking.

Such a solution cannot, however, be final, for mixtures are inherently unstable and liable to shocks leading to explosion. It is such an explosion which is threatened now, and which it should be the task of philosophy to prevent, if civilization is to survive at all. Mutual extermination being debarred, nothing remains but some form of toleration, which was the great discovery after the so-called wars of religion in Europe following the Reformation. Toleration is, however, only a palliative, not a solution of oppositions, and but a halfway house to that unity which comes from comprehension. That is the truly philosophic spirit, which tries to embrace variety in unity. For pure rationality is beyond mortal attainment, whilst reasonableness is what all may achieve by discipline of mind and heart. Now the essence of the philosophic life is the pursuit of wisdom, understood as the reasonable yet impassioned conduct of cultivated persons. Without this there is no civilization. In such an enterprise the lead should come from the professional experts in wise living, however much they may learn from the unskilled and yet reasonable part of mankind. Fine living is an art, to be learned from those who constantly exhibit it. Here is a task for both layman and specialist, in which the latter should supply guidance and example. Today people are demanding from philosophy that which they fail to find elsewhere, and without which they may give themselves over to despair and recklessness.

That there are efforts directed toward world-unity is fortunately true. The

United Nations Organization is well-meant for that purpose, but rival ideologies make it a theatre of conspicuous dissension. Ideologies today are sources of propaganda rather than of truth, and serve to darken counsel more than to illumine it. Again, the discussions of the World Council of Churches, whilst promoting friendship amongst the various denominations, render more clearly than ever the gulf that divides the Roman Catholic from the other Churches. The recent addition of a new dogma to the older ones of Rome, accompanied by the demand for unquestioning obedience from the faithful, increases disunion amongst Christians more than the Papal efforts for peace tend to unite them. Dogmatism, whether of the Roman or Calvinistic variety, is the rock upon which split all attempts at reunion of the Churches. As for cultural movements, like those of UNESCO and the broadcasts of the wireless service, they are so miscellaneous that the popular mind is confused rather than edified. Certainly they do not amount to a world-view, however admirable portions of them may be. And over all those attempts to unify the world, both by Church and State, looms the vast shadow of Bureaucracy, which is now to be found almost everywhere, and which spells uniformity, dullness, and rigidity of mind. It is one of the major evils of our day, making originality and creativeness and the joy of life very difficult.

Philosophy does not wholly escape the foregoing tendencies to petrify and divide the life of the spirit. But, so far as free from bureaucratic influences, it is pledged to independence of thought and comprehensiveness of view, as well as to well-balanced activity. In spite of grievous failures its aims are high and its practice salutary. Its chief difficulty today is in obtaining uncensored discussion by thinkers from all parts of the world. A world philosophy would be based upon the comparative study of the contributions of all peoples to human welfare, and so folk-psychology would be a major part of its research. This is a study hardly yet broached, and its lack a main source of our political mischiefs. But a critical inquiry into the rise and fall of civilizations, of religions, and of philosophies themselves, might reveal the secret of the progress of the human race. A great co-operative effort is needed from all peoples if humanity is to find its way forward, and philosophy should light the way. A pioneering effort of this kind was made at the International Congress of Philosophy at Amsterdam in 1948, in which participated thinkers from many countries of the world, exclusive of Russia and in the main of Germany. A perusal of its transactions will show the variety and richness of its contributions to world opinion, marked as they are by convergence upon a common task and by complementariness of points of view.

A more ambitious attempt is being made at the University of Hawaii, a geographical meeting-place of East and West, where distinguished American, European, and Asian thinkers are trying to combine the ideas of the Old World and the New. Perhaps from this centre will spring counsels for healing the feuds of the nations. Meanwhile, Oxford has founded a Chair of Eastern Religions and Ethics, whilst Cambridge has its distinguished Lecturers in the Comparative Study of Religions and the Philosophy of Religion. Near London a noteworthy experiment is being made at St. Catharine's College, under the guidance of Sir Walter Moberly, to enable university graduates and other students to consider 'the relevance of the Christian faith to the modern age

and discover what answer it has in face of the political and economic creeds of our time'. We are told that it has already been found to meet a deeply felt need. At Hawarden there are facilities in the Gladstone colleges for the study of theology, politics, law, and the like, by serious students, and similar enterprises are in consideration elsewhere; whilst at the new University College of North Staffordshire the training is definitely founded upon the principle of breadth rather than specialization, and is strongly imbued with philosophy.

It is odd that the ministerial training-colleges are among the last to perceive the need for such developments, though the Roman Church has long emphasized the need of philosophical training for its priesthood, and the University of Wales requires, as a condition of affiliation by the various denominational colleges, their possession of five 'chairs' of which philosophy must be one.

The Scottish universities and Churches have long been famous for their stress upon philosophic disciplines for their aspirants to office both in Church and State, and the Anglican Church published a report in 1944 by the Archbishops' Commission upon training for the Ministry, in which it is said that 'if our society is to be won back to the Christian faith, there must be more better-trained Christians—and many of them must be found among the clergy—capable of commending that faith by relating Christian theology to the intellectual, social, political, and economic needs of our time. Too much of this vast task is left to individual and occasional effort. It calls for active consideration by central authority' (p. 69). Methodism has been generally celebrated for its ardour, but not for originality of thought, and is deficient in that world-view here recommended. It cannot attain this without taking philosophy seriously. For 'philosophy buries its undertakers'.

ATKINSON LEE

KÖNIGSFELD A MORAVIAN SETTLEMENT

THE NEWS that Dr Albert Schweitzer, the great religious philosopher, missionary and musician, is completing his last volume of the *History of Civilization* in an unknown village of the Black Forest, has aroused interest and curiosity in all the civilized world. My readers, of course, will recall the moving passage, in which Gibbon describes the evening at Lausanne when he wrote the last words of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, and looked out over the Lake to the Mountains. We hope that in due time Dr Schweitzer will be able to write a companion passage, though possibly it may only be a mental view of the jungle and swamp in Central Africa.

Königsfeld, Schweitzer's study, is of special interest to the writer, who happens to have spent a year of his English youth there about sixty years ago. Though, in the course of time, Königsfeld cannot have the simplicity and pioneer feeling it had then, it is still governed by the Moravian Church. It originated in the days when Napoleon all but made Germany an annex of his Empire, and was a colony of the *Hernhütter*. They built first the Community Hostel there in 1808, then the Women's Convent in 1810, the Church in 1812,

and the Monastery in 1817. These constituted a large and self-supporting estate until 1869, when a Hospital and Boys' and Girls' Schools were added.

With the discovery by the medical faculty of Königsfeld's value as a health resort, a natural commercial development ensued, and the Brüdergemeine awoke to the value of their settlement two thousand five hundred feet above the Rhine Valley, and looking toward the Württemberg Alps. Situated at the summit of the watershed between the Rhine and the Danube, it made me feel as if I had a key to the door of all European history, which was my favourite subject at school in England.

Such was the village sixty years ago when my father, a Methodist minister, recalling John Wesley's association with the Moravian Brethren, obtained a guide to the Settlements and a prospectus of the schools which had been opened of late years. There were three schools: one at Niesky in Silesia, one at Neuwied on the Rhine, and one at Königsfeld in the Black Forest. It was to this last that I and my brother were sent in 1885.

Interesting though they were, I need not dwell on the impressions of a journey to Germany in the days of Bismarck's 'blood and iron', through conquered Alsace Lorraine. I remember the guard at Metz, pleased to speak English to my father, and saying, 'The next time we shall occupy France for twenty years', and the hesitation of the waiter at Strasbourg between talking French and German, and eyeing the other guests nervously.

It was at a very lonely station between Triberg and Donaueschingen that we left the railway and drove three miles through the dense pine-forests. Then we saw the compact settlement, grouped round the church and the square, the two schools, an orphanage, an old peoples' asylum (which today would be called a hostel); there was the village bakery, the village brewery, and the large old *Gasthaus* or inn. It was an alien Protestant colony in the midst of a Roman Catholic agricultural country in the Grand Duchy of Baden. It looked as if a colony of Wee Free Calvinists had settled in County Kerry, or the early Pilgrim Fathers in the Deep South. All around, for miles in every direction, lay the black woods.

In the following notes, allowance must be made for the distaste of a school-boy for foreign countries and general home-sickness; nor at that age could I judge the actual life of the village. No doubt there were weaknesses to which human nature, however godly and well-disciplined, is liable. I still remember the notice outside the original hotel of the Colony. Under the imposing sign of *GASTHAUS DER BRÜDERGEMEINE*, was a smaller notice '*Kein Lauter Heiterkeit Hier*'—'No rowdism here', which came as a shock to a boy accustomed to the home life of a Methodist minister, and made him wonder if it was all as idyllic as my parents thought. But I know now that this was only applicable to visitors, and that the good community led its rigid and contented life in a way that required no such warning.

The school had about one hundred boarders and fifty *Ortskinder* (children of the Community). Some twenty of the boarders were English, Dutch, French, and Swiss, all Protestants. Only one master could speak English: he examined us and placed us in our classes, and we were told that at the end of a month we should be expected to talk and listen to German only. The complete change from the education of a South Coast boys' school was interesting to us. It was

goodbye to hateful Algebra and Euclid as well as to 1066 and all that. The vast field of world history and geography lay before us, and the dates of Alexander the Great and Martin Luther still remain in my mind as clearly as those of the Charles's and the Georges'.

And all the time, we were picking up German words and phrases, and learning the proper sounds: full-throated Prussian. When we went out in time into other villages we were not long in discovering that they spoke a softer and broader speech which was called Swabian.

The food was distasteful at first, because it was so different, but I soon accustomed myself to salad running with oil—and at the end of the year, on returning to England, I detested and still detest the abominable combination of sugar and vinegar which my father had brought by tradition from the Vale of York. Boys in their teens are ready to take things as they come, and all that Oliver Twist asked was for more, however strange, the mess inflicted on him by Herr Bumble.

As much as anything, we missed the English school sports, and had to content ourselves with the school military corps, in which I learned to play the kettle-drum with passable efficiency, and was proud to be promoted to the big drum before I left. This was twenty years before International Scouts or Boys' Brigades were thought of. But as a concession to England, a modest game of football was introduced, though even here Prussian discipline ruled: I am possibly the only player left alive who was punished for kicking a goal when a master was keeping it.

The winter was long and severe, but we enjoyed the snow sports, not yet popularized by Sir Henry Lunn as winter sports. We preferred snowball fights to the long, long tramps through the forest to outlying villages. On one occasion, when a master had taken us too far and the company was in a state of mutiny and exhaustion, we only got home by the aid of a glass of *schnapps* all round, and the master, to his credit, organizing a game of Napoleon's retreat from Moscow. The long winter evenings were made enjoyable by *stille freizeit* (silent free time), when the master read aloud to us—Ekkehard, Gustav Freitag's *Stories of the German Army*, *Two Giants of the Guard*, *Strasbourg German Again*, *With Gneisenau and Scharnhorst*. But with all this, even my immature mind realized the difference between the strict military upbringing of the German, and the rather casual nature of the education at home.

To a minister's son, the Church services were of some interest because of the differences in the forms of worship. In the church at Königsfeld, the men and women sat apart; the whole congregation formed the choir; the organ with its heavy diapason dwarfed most of the chapel organs I had heard at home; the tunes were impressive, and the singing slow. On the last night of the year, the Watch-Night was held, a Moravian institution which was copied by John Wesley, and later more widely introduced in England. This Moravian Watch-Night in the deep forests at Königsfeld remains in my memory. It was attended by the whole Settlement. There was a litany, and directly the clock began to strike midnight, although on this occasion the sermon was not ended, the organ and brass band pealed out: 'Now thank we all our God.' Earlier in the service, a movement had occurred on the women's side, and two or three deaconesses had led out a very old woman: we were later told that, as the New Year came

in, she assumed second sight, and would proclaim aloud the names of those in the church who would die during the year which had just opened. This had occasioned such natural consternation that her predictions were now confined to a vestry and the presence of a few select elders. From this I judged that her utterances must have been largely correct.

Another memorable service was on Easter Morning, when we were aroused about an hour before sunrise by the playing of the village band, and in the dawning light the whole Settlement went in procession to the *Gottesacker* (the cemetery). After a short service, as the sun rose over the Württemberg Alps to the east, the pastor read the names of those who had died since the preceding Easter, and the old hymn was sung:

Behold how glorious is yon sky,
Lo, there the righteous never die.

These two services seemed to unite the future and the past even in the unthinking mind of youth.

This romantic aspect of religion has been described by Mr Algernon Blackwood in his Gothic story of *The Black Mass*, where Königsfeld itself is the scene, and even the names of the masters are some I remember.

But the long, dark winter, with its silence and snow, was passing, and it was on the afternoon of a Sunday in April that I saw the scene which has remained most vividly in my mind. We happened to be walking on a hillside open to the south, and suddenly, without warning, the sky cleared, and spread out before us was the whole snow-covered chain of the Alps, filling the horizon one hundred and fifty miles away. We had not seen them once during the whole of the previous eight months, and I can remember that I stood stupefied. The master with us told us that such a panorama was only seen some dozen times in a year. Like stout Cortez, we all stood silent, and though I did not shed tears as did the German boy by my side, I could sympathize with his doing so. That great and inspiring vision was absorbed unforgettably by the immature mind.

What though the radiance which was once so bright
Be now for ever taken from my sight.

Though nothing can bring back the hour . . .

We will grieve not, but will find
Strength in what remains behind,

In the primal sympathy

Which having been must ever be,

In the faith which looks through death,

In years that bring the philosophic mind.

Today, Königsfeld is a health resort, and the good Moravians have made it a centre of relief and intellectual culture. It has had its share in Germany's troubles and perplexities, and is paying the price. We trust that during his work, Dr Schweitzer will be inspired by the kindly and simple outlook on life which even at this length of time is a pleasure to me to recall.

T. DRIFFIELD HAWKIN

RESPONSIBILITY

IN ITS rudimentary meaning responsibility implies answerability, that is, liability to answer to *someone else* for one's actions and their consequences. Its birthplace may well have been a despotism under which every individual of the community owes fealty and is required to be loyal to an individual ruler, to whom he knows himself 'responsible'.

But the idea rapidly developed. The despot became merely the symbol of a system or organization of a corporate character, to which obedience was due, to which subjects were responsible rather than to any individual. This supersession of the individual ruler by an organized State as the real and final authority would be rendered easier both by the greater permanence of the organized State (*le Roi est mort: vive le Roi!*), and also by the actual power the State had to enforce the obedience of subjects: the king's power is really derived from the organized forces of the State which he can 'command'. The sense of responsibility is thus deepened and heightened by fear of the consequences of disobedience. The State (that is, the organized community) has effective power to enforce sanctions. This is equally true whether the system of government be despotic or constitutional.

As the political system develops toward democracy, the State becomes increasingly the expression of the will of the people, that is, of those governed, of the very ones held responsible. Hence arises the paradox of 'government of the people by the people' (which is strictly a contradiction in terms). The truth of the situation is that the people individually have come to realize and admit a responsibility toward the people collectively.

This brings us at once to a second most important aspect of the meaning of responsibility. In its primitive aspect it was simply something imposed from above: *A* was answerable to *B* because *B* had the power to enforce *A*'s obedience to his orders. But we see now the initiative passing from *B* to *A*, who is revealed as *accepting* of his own free will an obligation to *B*. The offering of loyalty answers the claims of royalty. To quote the supreme instance of this dual relationship, 'those of the truth' gladly acknowledge the claims of the 'King of truth'. This acknowledgement is no mere reaction to the pressure of authority, though authority may have been its *paidagogos*, its tutor. It springs from within the one making himself obedient, who 'becomes' the servant of that which he 'obeys'. It is the outcome of the consciousness within that one must have some master whom one must serve. Thus, instead of being made answerable by threat of force, we make ourselves answerable by act of will, by dedication. It is the essence of any real freedom that it should include voluntary acceptance of responsibility of this kind. There is actually no such thing as freedom to act irresponsibly, or, if there be, it is limited to very few and is extremely bad for them.

Acceptance of responsibility thus comes to be seen as one of the higher attributes of a moral person, rather than as an acknowledgement of inferiority. The higher the rank of the person, the greater responsibility he may have to bear, and indeed may be willing to bear. This is clearly seen in the case of the Prime Minister, nominally the first servant of the King, actually the first and greatest servant of the community, the 'greatest', who is 'servant of all.'

Thus we see responsibility as increasingly a burden willingly borne by the individual *making himself responsible*. It is to be noted however (and this is most important) that this sense of individual responsibility requires corroboration by others, who in turn must allow and consent to this assumption of responsibility, must admit that the individual concerned is actually responsible for what he undertakes. It is with the sense of responsibility as it is with the call to preach, or any other vocation. It must be confirmed by the consent and approval of others. Otherwise a man's assumption of responsibility may be mere impertinence and fussiness, and may not kindle gratitude but resentment.

We close with a question which may seem odd but nevertheless is important. Is it right to speak, as we often do, of the 'responsibility of God' for this and that? In the primitive sense with which we began, the answer is a definite No. One can only be held responsible to (or by) a superior authority, whose will or policy one is set to carry out: God by very definition has no such superior, and is certainly not responsible to us, His creatures. The Lord answers Job out of the whirlwind, and there is an end to all controversy. In one sense God is irresponsible: His ways are 'past finding out'. The clay may not question the Potter. But that is not the last word on the subject.

We have noted that the willingness to assume responsibility is one of the marks of personal greatness. This willingness to bear responsibility for the welfare of His own creation is surely one of the characteristic marks of God as revealed in the Bible, who says: 'I have made, and I will bear: I will carry and will deliver you.' Yes, responsible *for*: but is He also to be held responsible *to* His creatures? Formally, No: but actually we may say Yes, in a certain way. If the messengers of His Son are indeed to 'commend themselves (and their message) to every man's conscience', the assumption must be that to some degree those consciences are competent to pass judgement, not only on the hearers themselves, but also on the One whose word they are asked to receive. God Himself stands at the bar and abides our judgement, and, as the story of the Cross shows, suffers all our misjudgement of Him. In Christ Jesus God makes His own theodicy, so that, in the eyes of men as well as in His own, He may be 'just and the justifier' of such as accept His salvation.

A certain willingness to hold Himself accountable to men is implied in the Fatherhood of God. A father is one who holds himself accountable in a real and most intimate way for the welfare of his children. Jesus talked much both of the Kingdom and the Fatherhood of God. The two doctrines are complementary. As King He is the One to whom we are accountable: as Father He is the One who makes Himself responsible for us. Perhaps we must not say 'accountable to us', and yet there is in the thought of His fatherhood a distinct suggestion that He demands from us an *understanding* trust, such as only a happy child can give. There must needs go with the understanding and appreciation of the Father's goodness, a willingness to trust in the very many places where the child cannot understand what His Father is doing.

Good when He gives, supremely good,
Nor less when He denies.

He is the pattern Father, from whom 'the whole family in heaven and earth is named'. He is the centre of the whole organization. We cannot suppose that,

just because He is the centre and the final authority, therefore we may think of Him as free from the spirit of the whole family, the spirit of mutual responsibility and trust. Or why is it called a family? Why He a Father?

Because God's 'faithfulness reacheth unto the clouds', because His 'righteousness is like the great mountains', therefore it is the 'children of men' learn to 'put their trust under the shadow' of His wings. We cannot indeed call Him to account; but we can rejoice that He has made Himself responsible for us.

G. H. FINDLAY

AN INTUITIVE ACCOUNT OF THE ATONEMENT¹

DR CHAPMAN begins his book by showing that from primitive times men had 'intuitively' discerned that there is a conflict in the universe between two Kingdoms—variously conceived as the kingdoms of beneficent and malevolent gods, or of gods and demons, or of Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu, or of God and Satan, and so on. Men seek to win the help of the good beings (or being) and to drive away the bad—a contrast defined under the terms 'impulsive' and 'expulsive'—and do this chiefly through sacrifices. In the one chapter on the New Testament the writer, maintaining that men found salvation through the Death of Christ, claims that the first Christians were content with the evidence of their *experience* that this was so, and that the Apostolic writings do not even *imply* any theory of the Atonement. He holds that this attitude continued until such men as Irenaeus and Origen began to frame *theories*—and that to frame a theory is a mistake. Dr Chapman next surveys the theories current down to the present time. He shows how before Anselm the theories taught that Christ overcame the Devil and so overcame sin; from Anselm onward, on the other hand, the ruling concept is that Christ saved men from sin and so from the Devil. As to other theories, he claims that the Abelardians do less than justice to the fundamental 'intuition', and that with whatever variations, the *prevalent* theory till today is Anselmic—the new theories of the last century or so being only 'theories of the few'. At the end of the book Dr Chapman suggests that the Jungian sub-conscious may be the source of intuition. He has many illuminative quotations, though, especially under the Christian Fathers, he does not always give references.

While it would be possible to ask some questions under the general survey, there is no doubt that this is of great value. Again, it is happily true, of course, that multitudes of Christians have been saved by Christ without holding any theory of the Atonement, just as most men see without holding any theory of light—yet it is another thing to suggest that it is a mistake even to try to frame a theory. Or again, it is true that no theory can explain all the mystery of the Atonement, and it is also true that all theories about *anything* ultimately run up into unanswerable questions—but are theories therefore to be discarded? For Christians the crucial question, of course, is: 'What does the Bible teach?' Here I cannot think that Dr Chapman has proved his case. It is true, for example, that the idea of a conflict between God and the Devil is found in Scripture, but

¹*The Conflict of the Kingdoms*, by Clifford T. Chapman (Hutchinson's University Library, 7s. 6d.)

is this the leading *motif* in the Bible? Does it do justice even to the Old Testament? There is very little there about demons, while 'evil spirits' and even Satan himself are rather the servants of God than His foes. This, of course, is a difficulty for ethical monotheists in one way, but it is a difficulty for Dr Chapman in another. Satan is not identified with the Serpent in Eden till the Book of Wisdom. Dr Chapman seems to me to deal quite inadequately with the Prophets. He admits that they introduced a moral element into the concept of the perennial conflict, but claims that later Judaism, devoting itself to the sacrificial system, returned to earlier 'intuitive' notions. He says much about the sin-offering and the offering of blood, but he does not note that on the Day of Atonement it is the *live* goat that is driven away to Azazel, the evil spirit of the Wilderness. Again, he omits to discuss the Songs of the Servant, surely a great omission in view of their influence in the New Testament. In brief, even under the Old Testament his *perspective* is wrong. It is deliverance from their own sin for which the deeper Psalmists, for instance, long, and not deliverance from the Devil, however certain it is that they believed that he hovered around. In the New Testament it is, of course, true that through Christ men are 'reconciled to God' and delivered from the Devil, but has not Paul, for instance, an implied answer to the question 'How?', and are the doctrines of justification and regeneration and so on to be jettisoned as foolish probings after an impossible theory? Dr Chapman tends to bring everything about the Atonement in the New Testament under the term 'sacrifice', without defining this term exactly. Here he is like some others, but, unlike most of them, he seems to claim that even to begin to define is intrinsically mistaken. If I understand him aright, he even suggests that it is a good thing that the Old Testament provides no *rationale* of the sin-offering because it is *for this reason* that Christ is perfect sacrifice. It is true, again, that Christ drove out demons and defeated Satan, but surely it is primarily from their own sin that He saves men and not from anything or anyone outside them. Dr Chapman's book illustrates the current 'flight from reason' at an unexpected point. None the less, it is a real contribution to scholarship, and even those who do not accept its thesis will be wise to ponder its contents.

C. RYDER SMITH

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

(continued from page 287)

- The Congregational Quarterly*, April (Independent Press, 3s. 6d.).
 Puritanism and Capitalism (and Marxism), by Herbert G. Wood.
 The (social) 'Projects' of Daniel Defoe, by Ernest J. Price.
 Some Lapsed Dissenters, by the late Bernard Manning.
- Bibliotheca Sacra*, January (Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas 4, Texas, \$1.).
 Is the Pentecostal Movement Pentecostal?, by Roy L. Aldrich.
 Rome and the Ecumenical Movement, by René Pache.
 The political Philosophy of John Cotton, by Stanley D. Starr.
- The Journal of Religion*, April (University of Chicago, via Cambridge Press, \$1.85).
 Belief, Inquiry, and the 'Dilemma' of the Liberal, by William A. Christian.
 The Operational View of God, by Huston Smith.
 The Meaning of History and Religion in Freud's Thought, by Philip Rieff.
- Theology Today*, April (Princeton Press, U.S.A., via Blackwell, Oxford, 3s. 6d.).
 The Holy Spirit and the Trinity, by Claude Welch.
 The Holy Spirit and the Church, by Carl Michalson.
 Ernst Troeltsch—Thirty Years After, by Roland W. Bainton.

Recent Literature

L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Philippiens, by Pierre Bonnard, and *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Colossiens*, by Charles Masson. (Delachaux & Niestlé, Neuchâtel, fr. suisses 9.50.)

This is a volume in the *Commentaire du Nouveau Testament*. The two Epistles have been entrusted to the capable hands of two professors at Lausanne, and they have produced a most serviceable exposition, offering a French translation and running commentary, with brief footnotes which deal with difficulties in text and interpretation. Bonnard is fuller in the exegetical notes, and briefer in the footnotes. Masson is far fuller in the footnotes and confines his treatment of Greek words to these. Good use is made by both commentators of earlier commentaries, especially those written in German or French. It is surprising that Masson does not seem to know Peake's work on Colossians in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*. In dealing with the difficult text, Colossians 2¹⁴, he dismisses the interpretation that is based on the meaning of *embateuein* found in the Claros inscription. Perhaps this is because he knows it only through Dibelius's commentary, and has not read the interpretation by Sir William Ramsay, who was the first to make known this discovery in 1913. Neither writer includes G. S. Duncan's important book on the Ephesian imprisonment of St Paul in his list of books. Masson has reluctantly abandoned his earlier belief in the full Pauline authorship of Colossians. Space is saved by assuming that the reader has before him Nestle's *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Bonnard has a more congenial epistle to annotate, but, excellently as he has done his work, he would have done still better had he known H. A. A. Kennedy's masterly commentary in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*. W. F. HOWARD

L'homme selon l'apôtre Paul, by H. Mehl-Koehnlein; *Le Travail de l'homme et son Œuvre*, by Edouard Mauris. (Delachaux et Niestlé, fr. suisses 2.75 and 2.0.)

These are two essays (*cahiers*) in biblical theology; the first, in particular, is valuable. It is a study of Pauline terminology and its difference-in usage from that of contemporary Greek writers. The author treats in turn of the notion of *soma*, man as a living person; of the notion of *sarx*, as opposition to God; of the 'soul', (*psychē*) as a manifestation of life but not of Platonic immortality; of the mind, *nous*, as the conscious subject, not a principle above man or increate. Stress is laid on 'the anthropological reality of the Spirit (*pneuma*)', not analysable by psychological introspection, because it remains the Spirit of God while dwelling in man. Whereas in the Old Testament the spirit (*ruach*) always reveals the gulf between God and man, in the New Testament we have the 'spiritual man' indwelt by the divine. In the new life of the Christian there is an 'eschatological tension', the 'flesh' does not abdicate when man receives the Spirit: this is not a dualistic struggle, for the two powers are not equal and the Spirit will be victorious. There is the 'seal', but not yet the plenitude, of the Spirit.

The Labour of Man and his Work (what a pity that English cannot bring out the full value of *œuvre*!) stresses the importance of vocation in all good work. 'The working man on the first day is the image of the creating God.' Work is not the consequence of the Fall: but after the Fall work changed from play to obligation, pain, competitive struggle, ruin. Christians today, amid the 'curse' of industrial work, should look for its aim and find vocation just as much in manual as in 'bourgeois' professional occupations, refusing complicity in all systems that crush the creative capacity.

GEOFFREY PARRINDER

Where Science and Religion Meet, by Laurence E. Browne. (Religious Education Press, Wallington, 6s.)

This excellent book, a volume in the *Gateway Handbooks of Religious Knowledge*, can be recommended both to the general reader and to science graduates and ministers of religion. Dr Browne has not attempted to reconcile Genesis and science by falsifying both or to express theological truth in terms of present scientific opinion. For example, he does not exploit the electronic 'Uncertainty Principle' to prove human freedom. He maintains that if God is anywhere He is everywhere, and hence he has to include the problems of evil and of the great non-Christian Religions. Every chapter, but especially those on evolution and human progress, is in itself an excellent introduction to its subject. Dr Browne shows the place of intuition in science alongside experiment, though he hardly makes it sufficiently plain that the method of experiment involves the conscious neglect of those aspects of phenomena in which the experimenter is not interested. The distinctions drawn between value and survival-value, and between value and size, should reassure those who are perplexed by the dimensions of the universe. The difference between animal and human evolution, especially the part that man plays in directing his own evolution, and the examination of what we mean by 'better', are among the best points in the book. The closing chapter on Christianity claims that the aim of God's work is the growth of man into likeness to God. This is made possible by the incarnation of God in Jesus in whom a new 'mutation' entered human life. It would be a great gain if the scientists who discuss religion had as firm a grasp of Christian doctrine as this professor of theology has of the latest scientific discoveries. There is a brief bibliography.

R. A. LETCH

Radhakrishnan—Comparative Studies in Philosophy. (Allen & Unwin, 25s.)

In this book twenty eminent writers do homage to a great thinker upon his sixtieth birthday. He has long been both a philosopher and a citizen of the world, and has striven with all his powers to unify a torn and distracted civilization. Through his books, notably two volumes upon the history of Indian philosophy, he has become a pioneer in the vast and difficult field of the comparative study of philosophy. The present studies by English, American, Indian, Mohammedan and Chinese experts in that subject continue and expand his own researches. Whilst the writers keep the spirit of harmony which has inspired Radhakrishnan's work, there are large differences of opinion among them about the nature of philosophy, its possibilities, and its findings. The division of these under geographical areas or cultural patterns is of very questionable value, for philosophy has its own categories and types. None the less, upon the whole it is remarkable how much the writers' views converge in spite of all differences of point of approach. It is noteworthy that two Americans, Professors Moore and Northrop, in two striking essays exhibit the greatest divergence of opinion, and yet agree in the common need for a world-philosophy. This seems as remote—or as near—as a world-polity, but assuredly it is the objective for the next generation. The present volume is a notable contribution to that end. Yet it is odd that seemingly no representative of the great country to which Radhakrishnan is now ambassador, Russia, could be found to present his case as a philosopher.

ATKINSON LEE

The Concept of Maya, by Paul David Devanandan. (Lutterworth Press, 21s.)

The time has surely come when philosophy in general, and religious philosophy in particular, must take serious account of Indian thought. In Indian philosophy, whose vocabulary has been so much more stable than ours, one of the most fruitful lines of

study is the critical exposition of a key-word, as in this book. The author's scholarship is exact and comprehensive, his exposition and style clear, his philosophical grasp considerable. But the book would have gained much in depth if a consistent, instead of occasional, use had been made of a Collingwoodian approach—asking: 'What is the question to which all this *maya*-theorizing was meant to be the answer?', the reply being: 'It sought to show how to "save the appearances", if in the problem of the One and the Many the One has some mystic primacy.' This problem could then be shown to be an insoluble one; and that from this there flow all the peculiar characteristics of the *maya*-speculation so well set forth by Dr Devanandan—its constant association with religion and soteriology; its mixture of rationalism with retreat into the primitive sense of '*maya*' as 'mystery of cosmic power'; its series of restatements with the old antinomies always reappearing under new names; its continual vacillations, especially in the poets, between absolutism and theism; its ever-renewed attempts to make distinctions between 'unreality' and 'illusion'. Had Dr Devanandan written more clearly from this standpoint, he could have avoided his (very few) errors of exposition. There is a slight and apparently secondhand dealing with that very great thinker Śrī Aurobindo, a failure often to appreciate the modern Hindu objections to the translation of '*maya*' as 'illusion', and a wrong insistence on a contradiction between orthodoxy and modern activism in Hinduism. But a writer may claim to follow his own plan. Dr Devanandan's study is fully objective, and on its chosen level his book is both able and important. (The italicization and capitalization are not consistent.)

J. F. BUTLER

Islam, Beliefs and Practices, by A. S. Tritton. (Hutchinson, Home University Library, 7s. 6d.)

This most useful book, by the former Professor of Arabic at the London School of Oriental and African Studies, is *multum in parvo*. The style is extremely concise and all superfluous words are avoided. By this means the author compresses into 173 pages, chapters on Muhammad and the Koran, the cult, traditions, pious practices and main points of the Muslim creed, the religious code, sects, mysticism, organization of the Muslim state, social life, popular ideas, and modern movements. This is indeed a feat. There are also a valuable glossary and bibliography. One would expect a high degree of accuracy from Professor Tritton and one is seldom disappointed. Sayyid Ahmad (p. 160) was of Rae Bareilly, not Bareilly, and his disciple (same page) while properly so described, was more original in his programme of reforms than the sentence given to him would suggest. The last chapter has suffered most from forced compression. For instance, it is dangerous to assess comparative values as between Islam and Christianity in generalizations and snippets from history. Sometimes Islam suffers and sometimes Christianity, according to what one selects. Thus while Islam is tolerant of other religions, Armenian atrocities are engineered by government, yet (presumably elsewhere) mob violence has to be restrained by authority. To say that 'Muslims tell you that few men have more than one wife; missionaries contradict this' hardly does justice to the point at issue. All missionaries do not contradict and the facts can often be verified. The missionary is more concerned because permission for polygamy prejudices the principle of monogamy. May a missionary, however, commend this book, with these few provisos?

J. W. SWEETMAN

West African Psychology, a comparative study of psychological and religious thought, by E. Geoffrey Parrinder. (Lutterworth Press, 25s.)

Dr Parrinder, of Ibadan University College, has followed up his admirable treatise on *West African Religion* with this equally admirable study of the doctrine of the soul. It

is a valiant, and largely successful, attempt to bring together the fruit of his ten years' experience in West Africa and of his extensive reading. African ideas of the spiritual nature of man are incredibly complex and subtle, even more so than those of the psychoanalysts. It is high time that the subject should be treated with the seriousness here given to it. Dr Parrinder does me the honour of quoting frequently from my work on the Ba-ila for the purpose of showing the similarity between Sudanic and Bantu ideas. He confirms my belief that in this realm there is no line of division between the two branches of the African people. In particular, we agree about the beautiful concept of the guardian genius, which Africans share with Plato. Dr Parrinder rightly begins with the concept of vital force expounded by Father Tempels and of which he finds evidence among Bambara and other Sudanic groups. He then considers the 'soul' in its various manifestations: the personality-soul, the spirit, the guardian genius, spirits of the departed, reincarnation, possession, dreams, and so on. There is a chapter on the influence of Egypt and Islam on the African ideas which he finds negligible. The final chapter, which is all too brief, touches on the syncretism which is taking place in Africa and suggests some ways in which African religion and thought might be guided in their development. It is, of course, true that Christianity must become really indigenous, if it is to gain the African's heart, but how is the Africanization of Christianity to be achieved without de-christianizing Christianity? We might at least strive, says Dr Parrinder, to discover whether there are not fuller implications, in Christian faith and Church life, than those which we have found useful for our urban culture in Europe. If we talk to the African of 'saving his soul'—what does it mean to him? To which of his many names for 'soul' do we refer? Can we afford to keep on sending out missionaries without a knowledge of African psychology?

EDWIN W. SMITH

The Blessed Missionaries, by Edwin W. Smith. (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.)

In his Phelps-Stokes Lectures on Race Relations, delivered at Capetown in 1949 and now published, Dr Edwin W. Smith, missionary, anthropologist, and author, has given a very readable account of the contribution which missionaries have made to the life of South Africa, particularly to the African people, not only in evangelism and direct 'religious' activities, but in the fields of language, anthropology, education, health, philanthropy, agriculture, and social life, in the development of general culture and civilization, and in promoting understanding between white and black. Dr Smith gives particular attention to the activities of nineteenth-century missionaries in the political sphere, as advocates of justice for Hottentots and Bantu in land and labour policies, and in so doing gives an interesting historical sketch of European expansion and land grabbing in Southern Africa. Throughout the lectures the present situation and its historical background are kept in view. In the Introduction and in the last lecture the policy of *apartheid* and the meanings (for there are many) of 'equality' are examined. Dr Smith does full justice, unlike some of its critics, to the merits of *apartheid*, as once propounded, but he holds that it is now impracticable. His well-balanced discussion, clear in conviction but moderate in tone, recognizes the many-sidedness of South Africa's complex problems, and may be heartily commended. One quotation may be permitted. Speaking of the humanitarian fruits of the evangelical revival in Britain, the author remarks that 'South Africa, so long isolated culturally from the outside world, never fully shared in the evangelical movement with its deep humanitarian sentiment. Had there been a South African Wesley or Whitefield, things might have been different.' Will anything but an 'evangelical revival' bring to South Africa that change of spirit and outlook through which racial questions may find a reasonable chance of solution? (The title of the book is a quotation.)

E. LYNN CRAGG

The Methodist Heritage, by Henry Carter. (The Epworth Press, 15s.)

Mr Henry Carter's concern for the Ecumenical Movement, stimulated by his contact with Lutheran and Moravian refugees during the war, and brought to a focal point at 'Amsterdam', finds noble expression in this new book, which displays the same clarity of thought, the same remorseless logic, and the same passionate enthusiasm for a cause, which made the author so feared and respected by 'the Trade' in days gone by. The theme is an old one, but its presentation and purpose are new, for the author sets himself to discover what there is in Methodist history and experience 'which bears directly on the new endeavour of Christ's Church on earth to recover her unity'. Mr Carter therefore explores, first, the heritage which the Wesleys received from the past—from their ancestry, from Luther, from the Moravians—with its outworkings in worship, in fellowship, and in social obligations; and, second, the heritage bequeathed by the Wesleys to succeeding generations in churchmanship (though Mr Carter does not use that word), in testimony and teaching, and in vocation. The author's diligence in searching the original sources is abundantly clear, and while little of his material is new, it has not been used before just for his purpose. On every page, too, the authentic Henry Carter is plainly to be seen. Two points of detail call for comment. First, has not Mr Carter over-simplified the issues raised by Wesley's 'churchmanship'? Orders and sacraments, whether we like it or not, will bulk largely in any discussions which ultimately fulfil the intention of 'Amsterdam'. Here Wesley's beliefs and actions have left a legacy, the implications of which Mr Carter might well have elaborated. Second, there is the reminder (p. 161) that John Wesley's affirmation 'I believe' to his brother on the night of 24th May 1738 is earlier than the familiar description of 'the warmed heart' in the *Journal* under the same date. 'I believe' therefore is Wesley's first description of the Aldersgate experience and his 'testament' to future generations. This book has been written as a contribution to the Ecumenical Methodist Conference at Oxford this summer. No better hand could have been found to write it, for Mr Carter has long proved himself a lover of Methodism, of his fellow-men, and of his Lord. *The Methodist Heritage* is, as the Foreword tells us, primarily 'a testimony to faith in Christ'.

WESLEY F. SWIFT

O'er Every Foe Victorious, by J. Ernest Rattenbury. (The Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

Lord of All, by J. Trevor Davies. (Independent Press, 7s. 6d.)

So we Believe, So we Pray, by George A. Buttrick. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$2.75.)

By what he himself calls 'a happy coincidence', it was on his eightieth birthday that Dr Rattenbury sent to the Press the preface for his new book. This is the second volume of a trilogy. In the first, a series of devotional studies for Lent and Holy Week, Dr Rattenbury was dealing with the great historic facts of the life and death of Jesus Christ. In these new studies, treating of the Resurrection of the Lord, His appearances to His disciples, His Ascension, and the Coming of the Spirit at Pentecost, he makes the transition from the Jesus of History to the Living Lord and Saviour, known for ever in the believing heart and in the fellowship of the Church. A third volume is yet to come, in which the writer promises a similar series of studies, for Advent, Christmas, and Epiphany, thus completing the Christian calendar. All Dr Rattenbury's readers will desire that he may have time and strength to complete this task. These volumes are a worthy memorial of a distinguished ministry in which, together with his keen sense of the social implications of the Christian faith and his devotion to the sacramental tradition of early Methodism, Dr Rattenbury has always been an interpreter to his own generation of the great central truths of the Gospel. Here is the rich harvest, whose seed will bear fruit in many another ministry.

The two other books named above are upon kindred themes. Dr Trevor Davies, of New College, London, offers his own answer to the question whether Christianity has anything worth saying to this age and to the men and women of today. He goes back to some of the most significant incidents of the gospel story, and seeks to draw out their meaning for today. His is the book of a preacher keenly aware of the conflicting currents of contemporary thought, lit up with flashes of humour, at times annoyingly careless in quotation, but effective and arresting.

In the third book Dr Buttrick, the minister of Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, offers two series of studies based on lectures given to companies of ministers. The first series, 'So we Believe', deals with the central affirmations of the Christian faith. In the second series, 'So we Pray', the Lord's Prayer is expounded, clause by clause. This book also is a good example of popular apologetic and exposition, vivid, fresh, human, perhaps a little lacking in discrimination, so far as its illustrations and literary allusions are concerned, but instinct with a living faith and a desire to share that faith with others.

FRANCIS B. JAMES

Verdict on Jesus, by Leslie S. R. Badham. (Williams & Norgate, 9s. 6d.)

Why Men Believe in Jesus Christ, by D. W. C. Ford. (Lutterworth Press, 3s.)

If it be true that while there is no widespread evidence of religious revival in our midst there is manifest evidence of a quickened interest in religious matters, then here are two timely publications. Both of them start with the assumption that whatever else He is, Jesus is at least a significant figure. Both of them proceed to make the Christian claim that Jesus is the Incarnate God, reconciling the world to Himself, but there the similarity ends. Mr Badham in a spate of short paragraphs, which I found increasingly tedious, enlists history, philosophy, art, and psychology, to prove his case. While much of what he says is readable, much is superficial; and sometimes his dismissal of competitive claims is just impudent, as when he disposes of Communist Dialectical Materialism, to say nothing of behaviourism and Freudianism, in three pages. He proves too much far too quickly.

Mr Ford restricts his terms of reference, limits his objectives, and largely succeeds in doing what he sets out to do—i.e. in presenting a non-technical picture of Christianity as historical fact and explaining the sufficient reasons for its claims and its persistence. The writing is clear, the scholarship unmistakable though unassuming, and readers are left in no doubt as to the general answer which orthodox Anglicanism has given and still gives to those who say 'We would see Jesus'. Yet they will, I hope, feel the inadequacy of Mr Ford's chapter on the Christian man. This is not so much a reflection upon the author as a reminder that very much still needs to be said by Orthodox Christianity on Christian behaviour. There is a valuable select bibliography.

DONALD O. SOPER

Faith That Moves Mountains, by Cyril H. Powell. (Independent Press, 12s. 6d.)

This semi-popular study of faith in the New Testament consists of reflections on passages that mention faith or exemplify it. The author writes with a lively and attractive historical imagination, and often raises pertinent questions. He has not made much use of recent critical scholarship. His main thesis is not unfamiliar: that the New Testament progressively formalizes the meaning of faith. Genuine faith is found in the synoptic gospels (and, with qualifications in St John); in St Paul it is 'canalized into the thought of saving faith . . . that enables a man to find deliverance from sin and newness of life in God'; and the process is completed when it becomes 'The Faith', i.e. right doctrine. This is an arguable case though not all the details of

Mr Powell's argument are persuasive; but chief attention must be concentrated on his view of real faith. In essence it appears to be a miracle-working energy that connects 'our present material conditions with spiritual forces', so that even Simon Magus had a 'faculty of belief' though it was wrongly used and directed. The writer argues that a Christian can 'exercise faith of the same kind as Jesus used in his life', and insists that the natural (though startling) translation of Galatians 2²⁰ is 'by the faith of the Son of God'. Similarly, he thinks that the genitive of Mark 11²² must be translated 'Have the faith of God', where faith is a 'faculty by which God himself works . . . by which he believes a thing into existence'. But the Greek genitive is not simply the English possessive, and the new meaning proposed for 'faith' is surely somewhat obscure. By some accident what should have been Hebrew words on pages 16 and 147 have turned into meaningless symbols. KENNETH GRAYSTON

From My New Shelf

N.B.—For lack of space it has only been possible to give short notices of a number of important books.

Christian Faith and Practice, by Leonard Hodgson (Blackwell, Oxford, 8s. 6d.). When Dr Hodgson was appointed Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology at Oxford in 1938 he found that, outside the School of Theology, the curriculum did not provide any instruction in Christianity and that there was some demand for it. So he gave seven lectures year by year, open to all members of the University. They are now printed in their final form. The subjects are Faith (and Creed), Creation, the Atonement, the Incarnation, the Trinity, the Church, and the Christian (in that order). The difficulty in deciding what to include and what to omit must have been acute, but here, except that I wish that under the Incarnation Prof. Hodgson had said more about the New Testament and less about early Christological discussion, he seems to me inerrant. He calls his book 'descriptive', but it is implicit *apologia* too. He talks educated English, avoiding what some mis-call 'theological jargon', except where he has no option—and then he explains his terms. He does not mitigate the doctrine of sin. Hardly mentioning current theological discussion, he yet shows that he is aware of it all. He uses apt analogies—even one with the piston of a motor-car. Insisting throughout that Christianity is rooted in history, he yet claims a place for 'natural religion'. The positive 'case for Christianity' is here put with rare and effective and confident skill.

Christ and Time, The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History, by Oscar Cullmann, translated by Floyd V. Filson (S.C.M. Press, 18s.). This book was first published in German in 1945 and has already taken its place in the present ardent discussion of the Christian doctrine of Time and History (and therefore of the State). It is a great advantage to have a good English translation. In an extended review, queries would have to be raised under the Professor's doctrine that eternity is just 'endless time', under more than one point in the discussion of the State, and so on. But the book is one of the chief contributions to the discussion and no one should miss it. The writer distinguishes *en passant* the true and the false, as he understands them, in the works of Kierkegaard, Barth, Brunner, Bultmann, Schweitzer, and others.

F. D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology, by Arthur Michael Ramsey (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.). A brief but very lucid account and estimate of Maurice's teaching. It is set in the context of this 'prophet's' 'conflicts', and his later influence is traced.

Esquisse d'une Dogmatique, by Karl Barth (Delachaux and Niestlé, Neuchatel, fr. suisses 6.50). A French translation of Barth's *Dogmatik im Grundriss*, a course of lectures delivered at Bonn in 1946.

The Shorter Oxford Bible, abridged and edited by G. W. Briggs, G. B. Caird, and N. Micklem (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.). This abridgement is by selection. All the chapters but the first—i.e. from Abraham onward—are put under 'the Church', but each is assigned a subject, under which passages, often of different dates, are gathered. There are editorial prefaces (which indicate dates) at many points. Questions of proportion, of course, arise—e.g. there is a very skilful *catena* of very short extracts from Romans 1–7, but Joel has more space. Under 'the Christian Faith' the Apostles' Creed is followed, but does this great Creed give due emphasis to the New Testament doctrines of sin and atonement? However, under proportion *quot homines, tot sententiae*. This is a very careful and deft piece of work. The Apocrypha are included. There is a syllabus for schools.

Deuteronomy, Introduction and Commentary, by H. Cunliffe-Jones (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.). This 'Torch Commentary', like the others, practises the new homiletics—i.e. it elucidates the meaning and value of Deuteronomy both for its own times and for today. The Introduction is notably thorough.

The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit, translated with an Introduction and notes by C. R. B. Shapland (The Epworth Press, 25s.). This is the first translation into English, but it is much more. The Notes offer a very detailed commentary, which is packed with brief discussions of parallels in other Fathers and of possible alternative renderings. The Introduction provides all the *apparatus* that scholars require. For the Greek text Migne is followed but not infrequently corrected. Author and publisher are both to be congratulated on this fine book.

The Eastern Orthodox Church, by R. M. French (Hutchinson's University Library, 7s. 6d.). A concise but very competent account of the history, doctrine, worship, and *ethos*, of the Churches of the Orthodox Communion.

The Bible and the World, and *Triuminal Science*, with a pamphlet on the *Proof of the Authenticity of the Septuagint* (in one volume), by Apostolos Makrakis, translated by D. Cummings (Orthodox Christian Educational Society, Chicago, \$5.). Alexander Makrakis, who died in 1905, was a theologian, philosopher, controversialist, and intrepid propagandist in many parts of Greece. For the Orthodox Church, both in his homeland and in America, his works have become authoritative. He was a conservative of conservatives. Under reunion his one word was: 'Orthodoxy for all!'

The Fulness of Christ: The Church's Growth into Catholicity (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.). The reply of a group of Evangelical Anglicans to the Archbishop of Canterbury's request for statements on reunion. An irenic and very able exposition of the limits and value of 'unity in tension'.

Church Relations in England (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.). *Congregationalism and Episcopacy*, by Nathaniel Micklem (Independent Press, 1s.). In a sermon at Cambridge the Archbishop of Canterbury suggested that if some Free Church Ministers were episcopally ordained the way to Intercommunion would be opened. The first of these booklets includes the sermon and the Report of 'Conversations' that have ensued, with suggestions as to the next steps, if any, to be taken. In the second booklet Dr Micklem, one of the chairmen at the 'Conversations', shows why he does not 'feel sure that the difficulties are insuperable' for his own Congregational Church.

The Book of Common Prayer and the Worship of the Non-Anglican Churches, by William D. Maxwell (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.). This is the third 'Dr Williams's Library Lecture'. It is an expert's account of the influence of the Orders for daily Prayer and for the Holy Communion in the *Book of Common Prayer* on the liturgies of other British Churches, including a multitude of proposed liturgies. There are surprises in it. The writer puts

the story in its historical context from the Reformation onward and, apart from Methodism, brings it up to date.

The Free Church Tradition in the Life of England, by Ernest A. Payne (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.). For its third edition this fine book has been revised and brought up-to-date.

Order of Service for the Reception of Baptized Persons (into the Church of South India), commonly called *Confirmation* (Oxford Press, 1s.). An irenic document. For instance, there is one Introduction after the Anglican pattern and another to suit the Free Church mind.

Oxford and the Evangelical Succession, by Marcus L. Loane (Lutterworth Press, 15s.). Here are brief biographies of five notable Evangelicals—George Whitefield, John Newton, Thomas Scott, Richard Cecil, and Daniel Wilson. Two of them had nothing to do with Oxford but there was a true 'succession'. They were all Anglican clergymen and all 'moderate' Calvinists.

Kierkegaard, The Melancholy Dane, by H. V. Martin (Philosopher's Library, The Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.). So here is Kierkegaard among the philosophers—and rightly so, though it means that philosophy must take account of the irrational as well as the rational. Mr Martin, of course, cannot make Kierkegaard's teaching simple, but he does what can be done to explain it to a novice. In particular, he arranges his book with great skill. Of course with Kierkegaard philosophy is ancillary to theology and most of the book is about the latter. Dr Martin, who finds him 'a thinker after my own heart', does not attempt to explore such questions as 'How is Kierkegaard's teaching to be related to the rest of truth?', but is content to be an expositor. As an exposition his book is excellent. He rightly begins with a brief account of Kierkegaard's tragic life.

James Martineau, Selections, compiled by Alfred Hall (Lindsey Press, 7s. 6d.). Martineau's ethics and philosophy both 'date', if the word may be allowed, but no student of nineteenth-century religious thought can neglect the great Unitarian, and his devotional writings are rich and deep. His mind was large, but his life was larger. Dr Hall has made and arranged an anthology to illustrate his many-sided teaching.

Dora Greenwell, by Henry Bett (The Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.). Like Browning's Karshish, Dr Bett is a 'picker-up of learning's crumbs'—though, again like Karshish, he is much more. 'Dora Greenwell' is a subject just to suit him. He has three chapters—on Dora's life, writings, and teaching respectively—with a long series of notes. He cannot have left much uninvestigated, for no 'crumb' is too small for his gathering. Under the 'Life' the friendships are the chief item. Under the 'Writings' there is a justified claim that Dora is a neglected master of prose. Her 'Teaching' centred in the Cross. Here the right word is not 'explanation' but 'insight' and it is here that she is unique. At this point Dr Bett has known exactly how to let her speak for herself. He has, of course, much else to say especially about her teaching, if only there were room to write about it. This is likely to be the 'definitive' book on Dora Greenwell.

Letters of Herbert Hensley Henson, chosen and edited by E. F. Braley (S.P.C.K., 15s.). These letters show that with all his outspokenness Hensley Henson made many friends. They form, as the editor says, a valuable complement to his autobiography. Some of their marks are candour, trenchancy, lucidity, insight, and Christian faithfulness. Sometimes, too, there is something of Cassandra about them, for the Archbishops and other Anglican leaders persisted in policies that Hensley Henson counted wrong. About nine-tenths of the letters were written after he became Bishop of Durham. There is a striking caricature, drawn by a boy of sixteen.

Private View of a Public Man, the Life of Leyton Richards, by Edith Ryley Richards (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.). Mrs Richards has written the life of her husband with quiet and discriminative skill. Leyton Richards was far more than a 'militant pacifist',

as his churches knew and as this book abundantly shows. No wonder that some called him 'the happy warrior'.

Prophet Harris, by Margaret Mussin (Religious Education Press, Wallington, 3s.). This 'graphic and concise' biography tells 'the amazing story' of a West African Prophet. The Author sketches the background with great skill. I found it hard to lay the book down. (Is Grand Bassam rightly placed on the map?)

The Approach to Preaching, by W. E. Sangster (The Epworth Press, 5s.). *Teach Us to Pray*, by W. E. Sangster (The Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.). Preaching and prayer are high arts. Like all the best teachers of art, the President draws on his own experience. Both books search and stimulate. *The Approach to Preaching* is a prelude to *The Craft of Sermon Construction* and *The Craft of Sermon Illustration*. Taken together, these three furnish us with that rare thing, a good treatise on preaching.

The Gospel of God, by Anders Nygren, translated by L. J. Trinterud (S.C.M., 6s.). This is a translation of Anders Nygren's 'pastoral letter' to the Diocese of Lund when he was appointed Bishop. It is addressed to the clergy and shows what the 'central task' of a minister of Christ is. It is both scholarly and devotional, searching and stimulating, scriptural and Protestant and contemporary. On reunion the Bishop's word is: 'The unity of the Church is not furthered by offering any realized truth, but rather by penetrating deeper into the truth.' There is a reasoned defence of the Swedish habit of appointing one text for all sermons on each Sunday.

Twenty-five Sunday mornings with Samuel Chadwick, selected and arranged by D. W. Lambert (The Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.). Samuel Chadwick was a great expositor for the people. When at Leeds, he used to set down on Monday the pith of one of his Sunday sermons for printing and distribution. Here, too, his was a master hand—as these examples show.

Christian Certainties, by Ronald M. Ward (Independent Press, 6s.). For Mr Ward the one thing certain is the *fact* of Jesus Christ. 'In the light' of His teaching and person and work this book expounds the Christian doctrines of God and man—'man' including 'community' and 'sin'. Chapters are added on heaven and hell. Here there is plain and urgent preaching, founded on sound knowledge. The one theme is well sustained.

Behold, Thy King Cometh, edited by Brother Edward (Canterbury Press, 5s.). In this symposium eight clergymen, including Dean Eric Abbott and Father Geoffrey Curtis, write on various aspects of the doctrine of the Second Advent. They say little of the difficulties, for their 'concern' is with the practical and present value of this neglected doctrine.

Communion Meditations, edited by Gaston Foote (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$2). Of these 'twenty-five brief, reverent preludes to the Lord's Supper' twenty-four are by Ministers of various American Churches and one by somebody called 'W. E. Sangster'! The writers know how to illustrate. All the preludes but one are either on the Supper or the Cross that it foretold.

Making Sure of Things, by Frank Noad (The Epworth Press, 5s.). In these 'eighteen addresses for Women's Meetings', Mr Noad 'links life with the little things that belong to "the daily round"'. Now that they are in print, women's partners in the said 'round' may share these good things.

The Word of Testimony, by Francis Noel Davey (S.P.C.K., 2s.). In this Gore Memorial Lecture for 1950 the Lecturer, summoning the New Testament to his aid, maintains that, while the Church today rightly proclaims the messages of the periphery, she omits to preach and preach and preach the message of the centre, 'God in Christ'. Is he wrong?

Belief and Behaviour, by Eric W. Baker (The Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.). In 1950 Dr Baker gave the Willson Lectures at Southwestern University, Texas, and here they

are. H
rung

The
exposi
the lin
schola
the ne
findin
today
The
fifth

The
bookl
situat
limite
of his
raise

Qu
& Co
assoc
amid
1950
acco
insta

Th
Wall
sified
'mid

Je
(from
week
resu

W
Mr
wor
with

Se
May
A
a N

J. C
(W
T
Sco

C
who
did
21

em
'
to a
rail

are. His argument is like a well-made ladder, which, starting from 'behaviour', rises, rung by rung, to God-in-Christ.

The Christian World State, by Arthur Wood (Independent Press, 7s. 6d.). In this exposition of New Testament teaching about the Kingdom of God, Mr Wood follows the lines laid down in the nineteenth century, saying little of the problems that puzzle scholars today (though he settles one in a sentence—'(Jesus) certainly did not teach the near approach of His final coming!'). But of course there was much truth in the findings of the last century, and the author applies them effectively to the situation today after the manner of Copec, etc.

The Communist Millennium, by Maldwyn Edwards (The Epworth Press, 6d.). The fifth Beckly Pamphlet on Communism. Clear and concise.

The Open Road to Freedom, by Lionel Curtis (Blackwell, Oxford, 3s. 6d.). In this booklet the author urges that the one practicable way out of the present world-situation is for the free peoples to form an International Federation with real but limited sovereignty. He expounds the idea by the help of historical precedents. One of his colleagues at All Souls College has added a draft Constitution; three others raise cogent objections. This is a book to clear the mind.

Question: People at Work, edited by H. Westmann, two parts (Hammond, Hammond & Co., 2s. 6d. each). *Question* is the journal of 'The Present Question Conference', an association founded to 'reaffirm the importance of human values and relationships amidst the impersonal and materialistic conditions of life today'. At its meeting in 1950 seven papers were read on 'People at Work', which are now printed with some account of the ensuing discussions. Dr J. H. Oldham and Sir George Schuster, for instance, read papers.

The Cross-Roads of History, by William P. Cleland (Religious Education Press, Wallington, 3s.). A very good description (with a very few small flaws) of the diversified background of life in Palestine in the days of Jesus. A 'Pathfinder' book for 'middle forms' in schools—and for many others.

Jesus in Action, Daily Readings in Mark, by Eric W. Savage and Edgar G. Dunstan (from Friends House, Euston Road, N.W.1., 1s. 7d.). The Gospel is covered in thirteen weeks. There are explanatory and devotional notes on each Reading. Sometimes the results of rather 'advanced' criticism are accepted.

Without This We Die, by Leonard Weight (The Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.). I wish that Mr Weight did not seem to set fellowship over against worship for 'our fellowship' is worship (1 John 1³⁻⁷). But he does right to be urgent, for it is the stark truth that without fellowship we die.

Seller of Dreams, by William J. May (The Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.). Another of Mr May's vagrant and fragrant booklets.

A Book of Christmas Yarns, compiled by R. G. Martin (1s. 6d.); *The First Christmas*, a Nativity Play, by Alice Tregilgas (6d.); *Bethlehem Revisited*, Carols chosen by Arthur J. C. Kettla (4d.). Three books for the young, from the Religious Education Press (Wallington, Surrey).

The Children's Edition of 'the Service Book for the Young', prepared for the Church of Scotland, includes the first two Sections of the full edition (Oxford Press, 1s. 6d.).

Call the Witnesses, by A. W. Hodgetts (The Epworth Press, 1s.). Here six of those who saw the Risen Lord tell how they saw Him, and the Mother of Jesus tells why she did not. There are a few flaws—e.g. Thomas 'saw the Lord' more than once (John 21*)—and some additions to Scripture, but the stories live. 'I know Him now' is emphasized as much as 'I saw Him then'.

'Really, Mr Hoyle!', by Leslie D. Weatherhead (The Epworth Press, 4d.). A retort to an astronomer's attack on Christianity over the wireless. Written in a tone of genial raillery.

Songs of Desire and of Divine Love, by P. J. Fisher (The Epworth Press, 4s.). It is said that a man who knows his wines can judge a vintage by a sip. Well, here is a sip from 'Phil' Fisher's vintage. It is part of a poem entitled 'For Lent':

Come, let us to God's garden go:
There is a term to winter's cold.
More secret stirrings than we know
Are felt beneath the surface mould.
Life, howsoever darkly hid,
Must answer Life's awakening call,
Burst through its earthly coverlid
And blaze the Easter festival.

The End of Time, by J. A. Chapman (Blackwell, Oxford, 3s. 6d.). In a sequence of thirty-eight sonnets Mr Chapman looks at toil and war, scholars and poets, the Buddha and Islam, and many other things, from the End of Time, and adjudges them in its perspective. Finally the Star of Bethlehem shines again and Jesus is justified.

A Treasury of Sermon Illustrations, edited by Charles L. Wallis (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$3.50). In this book there are over 2,400 illustrations of various kinds, arranged alphabetically under subjects. There are five indexes, including 'Children's Stories' and 'Hymn Stories'.

The Whig Interpretation of History, by Herbert Butterfield (G. Bell & Sons, 7s. 6d.). This is a reprint of a study published in 1931. The readers of Professor Butterfield's *Christianity and History* will give it a warm welcome. In it he not only arraigns the school of historians whose last master was Acton, but develops his own account of a historian's real business.

Right Thinking, Its Rise and Standpoint, by Effie Hogg (Society for Spreading the Knowledge of True Prayer, 6s. 6d.). Here the writer expounds the creed that God is mind, that mind in man is God, and that sin and sickness are 'pseudo-mental' and therefore not real. She claims that this creed is scriptural. Is this a revised version of Christian Science, minus Mrs Eddy?

Cain, an Argument, by E. S. G. Bristowe (Bacchus, Leicester). This is the second book in which the writer, ransacking books on archaeology, has sought to show that the first chapters of Genesis are historical. The fulcrum of her lever is the claim that, as 'Sargon' means 'King Cain' (which is doubtful), Cain is to be identified with Sargon of Agade. But may not many men have the same name? The writer believes, too, that the Bible implies that there were 'men' before Adam, who were originally immortal, but lacked 'the gift of intellect'—and so on. It is interesting to note the author's use of such phrases as 'It is obvious' and 'Who can doubt?'

The Concert-goer's Guide, by Evelyn Porter (The Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.). This book deals first with 'The Instruments' (with illustrations), then with 'The Music' (including terms and forms), and then with Composers (forty brief biographies). I wish someone had given me a copy sixty years ago!

Strange Devices, a Story of the Siege of Syracuse, by J. O. Evans (Frederick Warne & Co., 6s.). This is a historical novel of the days of Archimedes, written for boys. I passed it to one and he gave it his *imprimatur*.

European Assembly, Summary of the Debates in the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, Vol. I (Hansard Society, 7s. 6d.).

Existentialism and Modern Man, by F. C. Coplestone (Blackfriars Publications, 1s. 6d.).

The Messianic Hope in its Historical Setting, by Lawrence E. Browne (S.P.C.K., 3s.).

A Plain Account of the People Called Methodists, by John Wesley (The Epworth Press, 9d.).

The Methodist Way, by R. H. Copestake; *Catherine Booth*, by Cyril H. Powell ('Little Books of the Kindly Light', The Epworth Press, 6d. each).

Tolerance—Can it be Taught?, by Albert J. Polack (Council of Christians and Jews, 6d.).
Getting Married, by Herbert Mills (The Epworth Press, 3d.).
True Marriage, a 'Church and Kingdom' pamphlet (Independent Press, 6d.).
Mother O'mine, in Praise of Mother Love, by E. H. Hobday (The Epworth Press, 3s.).
A Hundred Great Bible Stories, selected and condensed by Ralph Kirby (Odhams Press, 9s. 9d.).

The Supremacy and Infallibility of the Church of Rome, by M. Byrne; *Millions Accept a Dubious Dogma*, by A. W. Parsons (Protestant Reformation Society, 3d. each).
Science and the Quest for God (Essex Hall Lecture), by Alister C. Hardy (Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d.).

Archæology and the After-Life (in the Old Testament), by J. N. Schofield (Lutterworth Press, 2s. 6d.).

Intercommunion; Ways of Worship; 'Faith and Order' Reports of World Council of Churches (S.C.M., 2s. each).

The Story of a Backward Child, by a mother (Marjorie Shave) for mothers (Independent Press, 6d.).

Speedwell Plays: The Mob, an Easter Play for Boys, by Joyce Reason; *Sunrise over Olivet*, by Robert Bruce (Independent Press, 1s. each).

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Journal of Theological Studies, New Series. October 1950. (Cumberlege, 12s.).

The Church of England Today, by A. T. P. Williams.

Old Testament Chronicle, by G. R. Driver.

New Testament Chronicle, by C. K. Barrett.

do, April 1951.

Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament, by J. Munck.

(The new) Hebrew Scrolls, by G. R. Driver.

Nabonidus and the later Jewish Exiles, by J. M. Wilkie.

The Story of the Passion and Resurrection in the English Primer, by C. Hope.

The Harvard Theological Review. January (via Oxford Press, \$1, ann. subs., \$3).

The Problem of Immortality, by Erland Ehnmark.

A *Tabella Defixionis* in the Museum of the University of Reading, by J. M. R. Cormack.

Edwards and Hutcheson, by A. Owen Aldridge.

Phoebe's Letter of Introduction, by Edgar J. Goodspeed.

The Anguipede of the Magical Amulets, by Martin P. Nilsson.

The Scottish Journal of Theology, March (Oliver and Boyd, 3s. 6d.).

The Christian Understanding of Time, by Emil Brumer.

The Lamb of God (vs the Incarnation, The Crucifixion and the Resurrection), by G. Florovsky.

Church and Intercommunion, by William Manson.

A Wesleyan View of Reunion, by Franz Hildebrandt.

(The Right Kind of) Ecumenical Conversations, by W. Schweitzer.

The Hibbert Journal, April (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.).

Religion and World Unity, by S. Radhakrishnan.

The Education of Good Men (in schools), by M. L. Jacks.

China and Christian History, by Gilbert Baker.

The Devil's Dialectic (in T. S. Eliot), by Peter Munz.

'The World' in the New Testament, by Gilbert Cope.

Rylands Library Bulletin, March (Manchester University Press, 7s. 6d.).

Rabbula of Edessa and the *Peshitta*, by Matthew Black.

Samaritan Decalogue Inscriptions, by John Bowman and Shmarjahu Talmon.

The Cleansing of the Temple (Mark 11¹⁴), by T. W. Manson.

The first Manchester (and other) Sunday-schools, by A. P. Wadsworth.

The Expository Times, May (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 3d.).

The Use of *ἰδιωματισμός*, etc., in Biblical Greek, by Leon Morris.

The Mind of Christ: Is the Gospel Simple?, by C. S. Duthie.

Church Under Fire, by John Foster.

The International Review of Missions, April (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.).

What can we expect in the world Mission?, by Kenneth S. Latourette.

The Christian Origins of the Taiping Rebellion, by John Foster.

A Christian Communist Settlement in China, by Wang Shih Peng and H. W. Spillett.

New Help on Old Problems (in translating the Bible), by Eugene A. Nida.

Our Contributors

JOHN C. BOWMER
M.A., B.D.

Methodist Minister. Contributor to religious journals.

G. THACKRAY EDDY
M.A., B.D.

Methodist Minister. Sometime Muirhead Post-Graduate Scholar in Philosophy, Birmingham University. Examiner in Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Handsworth College. Member, Doctrinal Committee of Appeal.

MALDWYN L. EDWARDS
M.A., PH.D.

Methodist Minister. Author of *John Wesley and the Eighteenth Century*, *After Wesley*, *Methodism and England*, *This Methodism*. Beckly Lecturer, 1947.

G. H. FINDLAY
M.A. (LEEDS)

Methodist Minister. For twelve years missionary in India, and for six years with the Indians in Fiji. Previous contributions: 'Self-Identification' (October 1940), 'The Realm of Faith' (January 1951).

REGINALD GLANVILLE

Methodist Minister. Author of *Jesus and His Passion* and *God and The Jews*.

T. DRIFFIELD HAWKIN

Educated *inter alia*, at Woodhouse Grove, Moravian Schools, and Harrogate College. Became a Chartered Accountant. Founded the Atlantic Union and the Mayflower Club. Treasurer of the Bach Choir and the Federation of Musical Festivals.

G. A. LARDI
B.A.

Methodist Minister. Missionary Committee Representative in Rome since 1949. Born: Poschiavo, Switzerland. Educated: Poschiavo, Richmond College, and Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE
M.A., D.D.

Professor of Missions and Oriental History, Yale University, since 1927. Author of many books, including: *The Christian Basis of Democracy*, *Toward a World Christian Fellowship*, *History of the Expansion of Christianity* (7 vols); *Histories of China, Japan, and the Far East*; and important works on Christian Missions, etc.

ATKINSON LEE
M.A.

Educated at Cambridge University as student of Philosophy and Education. Lecturer in Education at University College, Aberystwyth for five years. Then tutor in Philosophy at Hartley College, Manchester, and Lecturer in the Philosophy and Psychology of Religion, Manchester University, for nearly thirty years. Member of C.O.P.E.C., Life and Work, and Faith and Order Committees. Author of *Sociality: the Art of Living Together*; and *Groundwork of the Philosophy of Religion*.

SYDNEY H. MOORE
M.A.

Formerly Headmaster of Silcoates School, near Wakefield. Translator of Friedrich von Logau.

E. GORDON RUPP
M.A., B.D.

Tutor in Ecclesiastical History, Richmond College, Surrey.

C. RYDER SMITH
B.A., D.D.

Principal, Richmond College, London University, 1929-40. Professor in Theology, 1932-40. President Methodist Church, 1931. Author of many theological books.

C. KENT WRIGHT
B.A.

Educated King Edward VII School, Sheffield, and Jesus College, Oxford (Classical Scholar). Twenty-five years in Local Government Service, the last twenty as Town Clerk of Stoke Newington. In addition to books on Local Government, Housing, and Town and Country Planning, has written or compiled various anthologies, including *Nectar in a Nutshell*, *The Lighter Side of Local Government*, and *Unaccustomed as I am*.